

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 10489) to perfect the homestead entry of John Hebnes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 10490) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Herman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 10491) granting a pension to Meta Sorenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 10492) granting an increase of pension to Margaret West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 10493) granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10494) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Speedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10495) granting an increase of pension to Josephine B. Scranton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH: A bill (H. R. 10496) for the relief of John A. Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10497) granting an increase of pension to Lola Qualls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 203) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of the ocean frontage of Afognak, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1317. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolution of Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County, Calif., requesting the erection of a public building at Placerville as a memorial to the late Hon. John E. Raker; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1318. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of American Yugoslav Club, of Eveleth, Minn., protesting passage of House bill 5583, providing for the registration of aliens residing in the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1319. Also, petition of American Yugoslav Club, of Ely, Minn., protesting passage of House bill 5583, providing for the registration of aliens residing in the United States and providing a fee therefor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1320. Also, petition of Izaak Walton League of Bovey and Coleraine, Minn., favoring enactment of House bill 7479, the migratory bird and marsh land measure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1321. By Mr. FENN: Petition of citizens of New Britain, Forestville, and Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bills 7179 and 7822, so-called compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1322. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of National Guard Association of Massachusetts, Maj. Gen. W. E. Lombard, president, Boston, Mass., recommending passage of House bill 9571 with the omission therefrom of the words "and regulations" on page 3, line 18; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1323. By Mr. GARBER: Resolution of the Association of Team and Truck Owners, opposing Senate bill 1734 and House bill 8266; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1324. By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Petition by H. J. Henrickson and others, in opposition to House bills 7179 and 7822, with reference to Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1325. By Mr. HOOPER: Resolutions of the Presbyterian Men's Club of Hillsdale, Mich., protesting the repeal or modification of the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1326. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 16 residents of Paw, Gobles, and Bloomingdale, Mich., protesting against House bills 7179 and 7822; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1327. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Associated Musicians of Greater New York, consisting of over 13,000 members, asking for a modification of the Volstead law to permit the sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1328. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of Mrs. Fred Childers, of Pillager, Minn., and others, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1329. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of members of the Association of Federal Employees of Central Minnesota, praying for the enactment of House bill 4005 and Senate bill 2363, proposing to place postmasters under the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1330. Also, petition of members of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Lodge No. 764, Montevideo, Minn., urging passage by Congress of House bill 7180, and remonstrating against the enactment of House bills 4019 and 5693; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1331. Also, petition of members of the executive board of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, guaranteeing the organization's unqualified support for, and backing to the bill proposed for agriculture relief by the committee for farm organizations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1332. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 75 residents of Nevada, Vernon County, Mo., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1333. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Alfred Brumme, Civil War veteran, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase of pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1334. Also, petition of Frank Smith, of Tupper Lake, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the World War veterans' act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1335. Also, petition of the Immigration Restriction League (Inc.), of New York, opposing the passage of Senate bill 1091; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1336. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition praying for immediate action by the Tariff Commission to establish adequate tariff on all dairy products by the following-named dairymen: F. J. Garfield, North East; W. J. Traphagan, North East; C. Jay Pollett, Corry; C. J. Lilly, Union City; J. Sherman Lilley, Union City; and Arthur Morris, R. F. D. No. 5, Corry, all in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1337. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of Brawley, Calif., protesting against the passage of House bill 7179, for compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1338. Also, petition of certain residents of Arlington, Calif., protesting against the passage of House bill 7179 for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### SENATE

FRIDAY, March 19, 1926

(Legislative day of Monday, March 15, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

#### DEATH OF JOHN C. COOLIDGE

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, this morning brings to all the people of this country heartfelt sorrow for the President of the United States and his family. This sorrow is accompanied by personal grief at the loss to each individual of a venerable man held in affectionate esteem.

Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 175) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate, having heard with great sorrow of the death of John C. Coolidge, father of the President of the United States, hereby extends to the President and his family genuine sentiments of condolence in their present affliction.

*Resolved*, That as a further expression of esteem and condolence the Senate do now adjourn.

Thereupon the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 20, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, March 19, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, Thou art on the heights, hidden now by the mist, but covered with fadeless light beyond the clouds. Thou art truly in our midst as we gather about Thy footstool and behold virtue receiving its crown. We would turn aside

from the dust and noise of the discordant world and advance through the sweeter air. We feel the warmth of His grasp and pulsations of his sincere soul. We are grateful that He did not live in vain. O God, our President mourns. Our whole country responds with bowed heads and sympathetic hearts. A father, setting forth in his earliest years resolved to seek only resolute worth, has hold of Thy hand, and nothing can be against him. The path amid the darkness to-day shall emerge into light; the desert shall become a garden, and the wilderness of earth shall blossom as the rose in the heavenly world. This mortal man, full of imperishable worth, has made heaven tremble with a still holier music and earth resound with a redeeming faith. O bless and comfort the afflicted ones. Lend them into sweet rest. Fill their minds with spiritual strength that shall enable them to carry the Ark of the Lord onward in power and in purity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3377. An act to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 6707. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

#### DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT'S FATHER

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That to the President of the United States and to the members of his family the House of Representatives extends the deepest sympathy in the bereavement which has come to them and to the Nation by the death of the President's father, Col. John C. Coolidge, whose character, gentleness, and simplicity of life furnish to all mankind an example worthy of emulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### FUTURE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to present a unanimous-consent request I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Roads for some time has been hearing various organizations of the country on the question of Federal aid for good roads. It has been the desire of many that a time be fixed in the future where all would know when this legislation will come before the House. The committee has recommended a bill, and while some individual Members favor a greater authorization than that provided in the bill than has been recommended, the bill received the unanimous sanction and approval of the Committee on Roads. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the 1st day of April, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, that it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9504, and that that bill remain in order until its final disposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that on the 1st of April, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, it shall be in order to move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9504, and it shall remain in order until disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if that is not a very unprecedented procedure? Why could not such a bill take its natural course, perhaps go to the Committee on

Rules and be in order at the proper time? What is the idea of picking out one particular bill and bring it up?

Mr. DOWELL. I will answer the gentleman's question. After discussing this matter with the floor leader I find that at that time there will be an opportunity to take this matter up for consideration by the House and as a part of the general program of the House. It has been understood that this bill shall fit in with the convenience of the program of the floor leader.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that answers my inquiry. I am inquiring if this is not contrary to all precedents?

Mr. DOWELL. Well, I would not have asked unanimous consent unless it was out of the regular order.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, then I object.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6707) making appropriations for the Interior Department, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6707) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint the conferees. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma.

#### SOME ASPECTS OF THE TARIFF QUESTION

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a tariff speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] over the radio on Wednesday last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by his colleague, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, on the radio. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert a speech made by Representative T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland, over the radio on March 17, 1926, which is as follows:

Some authorities derive the word "tariff" from the name of a buccaneer of the Spanish Main who levied tribute on commerce in the days when piracy was common on the seven seas. This pirate, if he ever lived, has passed away; civilization is restricting his trade within rapidly narrowing zones; private property in civilized countries is measurably protected from pillage by physical means; and the forces of injustice are more and more constrained to operations within the law, made possible by what is commonly spoken of as class legislation. Of course, as long as human nature is selfish there will always be injustice and oppression from sources where too much power is lodged, and one of the main purposes of legislation is the protection of the weak from the strong, and when class legislation adds to the power of the strong the great masses of the people are bound to suffer.

Tariff legislation has grown to be distinctly and frankly in the interest of a class who comprise a very small percentage of the American people. The tariff certainly works a great hardship on American labor. It is very doubtful if the tariff is of any help to American labor as a whole in the matter of wages, and the high-tariff advocates themselves, in moments of frankness, admit that not more than from 5 to 10 per cent of the present tariff is necessary to take care of the differential between the wages of foreign labor as compared to American labor, allowing, of course, for the much greater efficiency of American labor and taking into consideration the constantly reduced labor overhead due to labor-saving machinery. Certainly more than 50 per cent of the tariff tax is reflected in the increased cost of the necessities of life to the American workingman, so that the consumption tax he has to pay because of the tariff is bound to be much more than any possible wage increase because of it.

Any indirect benefit the ordinary salaried man, the bank employee, the merchandise clerk, all that great middle army of employees whose income changes very little from year to year, derive from the tariff is of more than doubtful validity and at most is very small, but they, as the ordinary laboring man, feel the intolerable burden of the increased cost of living.



The troubles of the American farmer are directly attributable to the so-called emergency act of 1921 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. After the World War Europe was greatly impoverished. All of her money and everything she could borrow, principally from the United States, had been spent in war, but Europe needed our wheat, our corn, our cotton, and our beef. Europe said: "We have no money, but we can make shoes, and hats, and suits of clothes, and overcoats, and dresses, and underwear, and hosiery, and cutlery, and the things that go to make up farming implements, and we can sell them to you at a moderate price; buy our goods, so that we can get the money to buy your wheat and corn and beef and cotton; in other words, trade with us, and we can buy your farm products to feed our people; you will not only be helping us, but creating a foreign market for your farm products, and so keep their price up to a reasonable level."

But the party in power said: "No; we want the great manufacturers of New England and the East to wax fat as never before; we don't want to give our people the opportunity to buy at a reasonable price hats, suits, overcoats, dresses, underwear, hosiery, cutlery, and the materials that go to make up farming implements, so we will pass a tariff act while we are in power and fix the duties on European imports so high as to make it impossible for European goods to come into this country to any extent, and then the manufacturers in whom we are interested can boost their prices as high as the traffic will bear; we know the duties we are levying will not produce the most revenue for the United States Treasury; we know that these duties are not necessary to enable our manufacturers to live and make a fair profit; we know we are destroying our farmers' foreign market; we know that we are making it hard and ever harder for the average American family to buy the things which make up the comforts of life; but the 'special interests' put us in power, and if we stick to them they will be able to keep us in power for some time to come." On June 27, 1922, in the course of a speech in the House of Representatives on the cotton duties of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, commenting on a concealed duty (called a "joker") in the cotton schedules, I said: "It is estimated that section 905 A alone of the tariff, this cynical 'joker' inserted at the suggestion of the lobbyist Lippett, will filch from the American people the colossal sum of \$750,000,000 annually, an average of \$37.50 from every family in the land; and as cotton goods are used by everyone, and as there are more poor people than any other class, the backs of the poor will be bowed under the greater part of this awful burden, and while the golden flood, wrung from the people, is poured into the laps of a few rich cotton manufacturers, I say to them that they are depriving the poor of the simplest necessities of life; I say to them also that their wives and their daughters, when they cover themselves with their gowns of silk, have not been clothed by the worm alone, but their raiment has been spun from the bowels of babes." Section 905 A was slightly changed before passage, but my estimate of its cost to the American people was evidently too modest, for a carefully written article in the New York Times of March 7 last, in referring to the cotton schedules, makes this statement: "By cunning phrasing a given cloth appears to be in one class, while in fact it is in another at a higher rate because of certain technical conditions; and again, because of these same conditions, a still further duty is elsewhere added, making a double penalty for the same thing. The broad proof of the matter is the commonly known fact that the American pays a good average of one-fourth more for his cotton goods, in whatever form used, than the people of any other comparable nation. Its direct and indirect cost to the consumers of this country is not less than \$800,000,000 annually."

On June 29, 1922, in speaking in the House on the sugar schedules of the then pending tariff bill I made the statement that the sugar tariff alone would greatly burden the American people, and in protesting against it said: "The poor man's coffee requires sugar; the bread which feeds the family of the toiler is made with sugar; the modest pudding or pie which helps out so much the ordinary steady diet would not be fit to eat without sugar; the ices of summer, the cake for the children's school lunch basket, the custards, and most of the delicate nourishments for the sick and infirm could not be produced without sugar; in every home, no matter how humble or destitute, sugar is a necessity; and yet the duty on sugar is being boosted to a hitherto unknown height, and in a way which will cost the American people around \$100,000,000 annually." Again I seem to have been conservative, because in 1925 the Sugar Trust alone was subsidized by the sugar tariff to the extent of \$106,000,000, besides what the people paid in duties on foreign sugar through the custom-house.

But I have talked long enough about unpleasant things. Some time, if you will listen, I may speak about what was done with the wool schedules and the way that the Aluminum Co. of America, an absolute American monopoly, is trebly protected from any foreign competition, not only by the duties on aluminum, but on manganese and magnesium, which would come into competition with aluminum. To-night I am going to add only something to the brighter side of the picture. The tariff act of 1922 was passed in a period of reaction, was passed following the war period of mental and spiritual elevation and therefore naturally reflects the domination of powerful, selfish interests;

but the country is readjusting itself. The reaction from the war is largely dissipated. With nearly \$8,000,000,000 of foreign loans scattered over the country the great international bankers and the banking corporations and individuals carrying these loans are having their minds focused on the fact that if these loans are to be paid it must be by international trade, and that international trade can be fostered only by lowering the duties on importations of foreign goods.

The farmers of the country, who, in 1922, could not be made to see that the tariff would not benefit them, have come to understand that a tariff can not help the price of an agricultural product of which there is an exportable surplus. These things and the constantly widening spread of education among our people as a whole are all combining to make the position of the present tariff law increasingly difficult to maintain. Special privilege is confronted also with the often subconscious spirit of the American people, a spirit which recognizes that injustice always brings with it an ever-widening circle of social evil, and that tolerance, sympathy, and fair dealing in legislation, as in everything else, blesses him that gives as well as him that receives.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is the birthday of a great American. He was long the leader of the oldest political party in the Nation, and yet during all the years of his life he never held elective office save for the two terms that he was a Member of this House as a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

On the part of Nebraska I want to thank the Speaker and the leader of the majority [Mr. THOMSON] for having given us this opportunity to pause in our labors for an hour that we might pay tribute to the memory of one of the most distinguished men who ever sat in this body—that great citizen of the Republic and true Democrat, William Jennings Bryan.

The first time I ever saw Mr. Bryan was just one month before he was nominated for the Presidency in the great convention held at Chicago in 1896. The occasion was a joint debate between himself and another distinguished citizen of Nebraska on the money question.

Mr. Bryan was then in the full flower of his young manhood, matchless in eloquence and debate, the perfect picture of a man in his physique, and wonderful in the magnetism of his personality. Take him for all in all as he was that day, I never expect to look upon his like again.

The nomination of this young man for the Presidency at once made the young State of Nebraska the political storm center of the Nation. Mr. Bryan advertised Nebraska and made Nebraska famous throughout the length and breadth of the Republic and to the very ends of the earth. The names of Nebraska and Bryan became in a certain sense synonymous. Nebraska was referred to as Bryan's State, and so far as his party was concerned Nebraska certainly belonged to him. For 20 years the Democrats of Nebraska never denied him anything, and throughout those years Mr. Bryan gave us in return the very best that was in him.

I think perhaps the greatest legacy that Mr. Bryan left to Nebraska was that he taught her youth the value and power of a great ideal; that in order to stamp one's impress deeply on the world it is not necessary to be counted with the majority, but rather to stand steadfastly for that which you yourself deem to be right; that neither wealth nor power nor position is essential. It is the thing you stand for and the thing you do.

Other men whose influence upon our public life is comparable with that of Mr. Bryan have held high office and all the power and prestige that go with place and position. But Mr. Bryan did not need them. They were not necessary to him. Though defeated five times for the highest offices in the gift of his country—three times for the Presidency and twice for the United States Senate—he grew steadily stronger and stronger in public esteem, in spite of successive defeats. Like the fabled wrestler of old with whom Hercules strove, every time Mr. Bryan was thrown back upon the people whose champion he was he rose doubly strong for the next conflict.

Though he was denied the influence of office, no man in his generation left a deeper impress upon the life and legislation of the Nation than did Mr. Bryan. He, more than any other man, was responsible for the writing of two vital amendments into the Constitution of the United States—the one providing for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people and the other prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors within the Republic.

Mr. Bryan was a sincere and true patriot. Next after his Maker, he loved the American Republic, its institutions, and its people. His political trinity was representative government,

universal education, and constitutional liberty, and no man was ever a better or more constant champion of these three fundamentals of popular government than Mr. Bryan.

He was taken from us while still in possession of those wonderful powers that made him a great leader among men. In the later years of his life, when his friends appealed to him to spare himself, he often told them that he did not expect to live to a great age; that because the battle must soon be over he wanted to keep on fighting until the very end. And he did.

I think it was supremely fitting that this last great soldier in the cause of the common good should have fallen in harness, fighting with his face to the foe as bravely and truly as did the first. And the first real fighter for constitutional liberty among English-speaking people was stout old Simon de Montfort, who was ambushed at the Battle of Evesham by the overwhelming forces of the King of England. A follower who rode beside him said to him:

My lord, the King's men outnumber us ten to one. Nothing is left to us but to surrender or to flee.

But De Montfort said to him:

Not so. One other thing we can do to-day as Englishmen for England, and that is to die like men upon the field of battle in a just cause.

And, as he laid his lance at rest to make his last charge, before he drove spurs into his horse's flanks, he rose in his stirrups and called to the little band of faithful knights about him:

Gentlemen, commend your souls to God; our bodies are the enemy's.

And so he died, fighting gloriously that you and I and every man that speaks the Saxon tongue might have a representative form of government and might be free.

The names of those who won upon that fatal field are lost amid the oblivion of 700 years, and will be heard of no more in human history; but the name of him who fell in behalf of constitutional liberty and representative government who gave his life that you and I might be free—his name will live until the English language is forgotten.

And so with him whom we honor here to-day. Though thrice defeated for a prize more valued than any that ever crowned a king, the name of Bryan will live in the history of his country so long as men love liberty and are determined to maintain it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, we mortals are so prone to self-laudation that oftentimes we praise in others only the things with which we find ourselves in accord and thus through them attempt to exalt ourselves. In such words of eulogy as I shall use in connection with the name and fame of the peerless orator from Nebraska I shall not be justly chargeable with this fault. There have been few public men of our day with whom I have found myself so habitually and so completely in disagreement on great public questions as with Mr. Bryan. Therefore, anything that I may say will not be tinged with the prejudice of bias or a leaning toward his views or policies.

My admiration for Mr. Bryan was as a man, for his clean personal character, for his zeal in every righteous cause as he saw the right, and for his fervent hatred of wrong as he conceived wrong. Mr. Bryan spent much of his life in what may be called active politics, but even in his political activities he was essentially an evangelist, a crusader, rather than a master politician or statesman. Free silver with him was not so much an economic policy as it was a means of righting what to his mind was a great wrong, so that into a fight against this supposed wrong he unreservedly and enthusiastically threw his fervent zeal and great oratorical powers. The fancied wrongs of an idealized Filipino people stirred his crusading nature in the same way. In the theory of evolution he saw what he deemed a monster wrong, and proceeded to make war upon it with all his superb powers.

Mr. Bryan was one of the most notable public men of his day, being three times his party's candidate for the greatest office within the gift of the people, but he held few public offices. He was for two terms a Representative in Congress and for a brief period Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Wilson. Faithful and patriotic in every office held by him, as he was in all things, not even his most partisan admirer would probably claim that any public office he ever held added anything to his public reputation or prestige. He was not the ordinary job holder in any sense of the word, and his claim to greatness and fame as a public man does not rest upon official service.

His great power as an orator, his ability to sway the minds and emotions of his fellow men are the preeminent qualities that marked him out as one of the great and notable figures of

his day. His fine, clean, personal character as a man and a Christian was the foundation upon which the confidence of millions of his admirers rested. His intense zeal displayed in the advocacy of any cause espoused by him kindled the enthusiasm of his faithful followers. His fervent hatred of wrong as it revealed itself to him, and his readiness to engage it in mortal combat manifested the spirit of the genuine crusader that no mere temporary defeat could fully overcome.

Mr. Bryan made for himself a conspicuous place in the history of his country where his memory will remain enshrined in the hearts of millions who loved him. He will be long remembered as one of the most notable and outstanding figures of his day and generation. As one who holds different political and governmental views from those to which Mr. Bryan devoted much of his great energy and ability; in fact, as one who scarcely ever agreed with him in anything except in our love for our common country I am glad to bring this humble tribute to the life and character of a great American.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes devoted to reflections by the Members of the United States Congress to pay their respects to men and women who have passed on, and who helped to make possible our progress in civilization, appeals to me as time well spent.

William Jennings Bryan was a native of the State of Illinois. He was born just prior to the Civil War, and his early years were largely influenced by these circumstances. President Lincoln, a citizen of the State, doubtless had great influence both in his early and later life.

There are many things in common between the two. Lincoln's saying, "The Lord must have loved the common people, he made so many of them," and Bryan being known as the "Great Commoner" shows their mutual love for the middle classes which they both served so devotedly.

Mr. Bryan located in Lincoln, Nebr., soon after reaching his majority. Another coincidence—the adopted city of his future home had the same name as the martyred President. Both Lincoln and Bryan had great faith in the average American citizen and were always willing to appeal to them and conform to their decisions on public questions.

March 19 of each year in Nebraska was given over by many citizens to the celebrating of Bryan's birthday. People who did not agree with him upon public questions united in crediting him with being one of our most appreciated citizens. Being known as the "Great Commoner," he gave his life's work in the advocacy of principles that he believed were to the people's interest, always endeavoring to bring the Government as close to the people as it was possible.

He was a pioneer in his efforts to have passed in different States the initiative and referendum laws, believing the people had the right to initiate and to have referred to them for their final decision matters in which the public was vitally interested.

His greatest life's effort was made in his presidential campaign in 1896 to have our circulating medium increased. While not entirely successful in his efforts, it was an educational campaign, and his correct theories of an increase in our money circulation has been thoroughly vindicated.

The Federal bank act, credited by many to be one of the greatest laws enacted in this country was, to quite an extent, of his origin.

He was a pioneer in his efforts to have our United States Senators elected by popular vote.

As a statesman he was not recognized as a "faultfinder," but adopted the plan of presenting constructive ideas and had the moral courage to carry his ideas to the people for their endorsement or rejection.

In his three campaigns for President of the United States his only way of reaching the people was by the platform method. His memorable campaigns will long be remembered as aggressive educational campaigns that required a physical giant to endure the strain.

Mr. Bryan identified himself with the church when a mere boy. He indorsed the teachings of the Bible in its entirety, and took the Bible as his guide and inspiration for his life's work. He has been known at great political gatherings where he was not certain as to the issue to ask Divine guidance. He gave much time to lectures upon the platform, as well as in our universities to the students of the Nation, believing that Government would be better if administered by Christian people.

Having lived in the same congressional district, and now trying to represent the district that was so ably represented for four years by Mr. Bryan, I knew him as well as it was possible for one neighbor to know another. I always recognized him as the "pathfinder" for the common people of America and always willing to champion their cause. He made



the fight for them. He kept the faith with them. The influence of his work does not close at the grave, but extends down through the ages.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to my colleagues from Nebraska for inviting me to have a place on this program.

Not often will the House suspend its ordinary proceedings to consider the life of a more notable man than Mr. Bryan.

There have been others as persistent as he in constantly impressing the need of the observance of the principles of individual morality, which are not different from the principles of morality in government, as being essential to the endurance of our institutions. There have been others, like Washington himself, who, with the same clearness and force which were characteristic of Mr. Bryan, have held that the influence of moral sanctions will fade and wither if not supported by the sanctions of religion. But certainly no one has ever stood more consistently for these things or fought more valiantly in their behalf. Who can measure—the historian will perhaps not seek to measure—all that Mr. Bryan and his great contemporary, Mr. Roosevelt, accomplished for the Republic in exemplifying and advocating the righteousness without which neither men nor nations can be exalted.

In estimating Mr. Bryan, however, I believe that those who in the coming days will calmly write the history of our time will record that he stood beyond nearly all others in the front rank of the great orators of the world. They will ask who among the ancients, who among the moderns, possessed such a gift of speech and by its use moved and inspired such a multitude of followers, and they will name no one who is easily comparable.

So striking was his personality, so musical his voice, so appropriate and eloquent his utterance, that we who knew him—even though not intimately—can almost see him now. Imagination almost refuses to accept his loss and looks for his reappearance, and memory retains his image like a thing of yesterday.

I saw him first when a youthful Member here he thrilled the House and the country by a speech that made him at once a national figure. Not much later I saw him again, a candidate for the highest office, unexpectedly nominated by a convention over which his oratory had cast a spell, crusading the country and rallying to his leadership millions of his fellow citizens. A decade after that I happened to be in London when, in the hall of the House of Lords, he spoke to a meeting of the Interparliamentary Peace Union. In the midst of his address that audience, representing the flower of European intellect and thought—an audience not easily moved—rose up and acclaimed the speaker. The next morning the newspapers were filled with editorials commending what one of them called the "very noble eloquence" of the American. The final occasion on which I saw him was at a birthday dinner which he gave here last year. It was apparent that his fine nature had not suffered from the effect of many defeats and adversities. He was alert in his bearing, delightful in the greeting he offered his guests, and eager in the statement of his unswerving beliefs. Seated near him was the Vice President, and I wish I could recall the gracious words spoken of each about the other by the two men who in their early manhood, as citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., had been bound together by close ties of friendship never to be broken.

That evening Mr. Bryan and his brother were planning to visit the home of their paternal ancestors in Virginia. Among the beautiful hills of Rappahannock County, in the shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains, his great-grandfather located and his father was born. I have seen the unpretentious house, still standing, which his people occupied in the period when Virginia was making her unforgettable contributions to the movement for independence the foundation of the new government, and the beginning of the wonderful experiment projected by those who worked and wrought for better institutions than the world had known. The place was not far distant from the homes of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. And when the grandfather and father took their way westward they went from an atmosphere saturated with the political doctrines of which those statesmen were the great apostles.

After his passing the President wrote of Mr. Bryan words which, in conclusion, I desire to place in the RECORD. Mr. Coolidge wrote:

Mr. Bryan has been a prominent figure in public affairs for a third of a century. He has been a leader in the advocacy of many moral reforms and was representative of the effort for purity in our political life. He was endowed with the great gift of eloquence. The sincerity of his motives was beyond dispute. He was three times chosen head of a great political party, and held the exalted office of Secretary of

State. His career was another example of what American opportunity affords to those who have the will industriously to apply themselves. It would be difficult to find among his contemporaries anyone with so large a circle of friends and acquaintances who had so generously bestowed upon him their esteem and confidence.

That generous expression, I am sure, is echoed by the Members of this House, without regard to party division.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world breathed less apprehensively when from far St. Helena was flashed the news of the death of the mightiest military chieftain of any age or clime or country.

The civilized world was hushed to tears in that July evening when came the news that the greatest earthly champion of human rights in any age had fallen asleep in Dayton, Tenn.

I knew him as chum knows chum, as lover knows sweetheart, as soldier knows loved captain and commander. He was magnificently human. He was so clean and so pure that the very presence of him lifted men to better thoughts and higher aims. Myriads of men believed in Bryan unflinchingly, and perhaps he had a larger personal following than any other mortal. On many occasions this faithful army of believers witnessed the personal defeat of its loved leader, but as often later witnessed the triumph of his ideals.

If it be true, Mr. Speaker, as the greatest among men are now proclaiming, that the crown of greatness rests upon the head of him who performs largest service to his fellow men, then have we the sweet assurance that forever upon the brow of the memory status of our Bryan will rest a flara in which the most effulgent gem will be the Koltnoor of service. [Applause.]

If it be true, as the priests of God are now proclaiming, that a pure personality, next to the precepts of the gospel of the Christ, is the most potent appeal for the uplift of the human family, then it must be that the example of the pure life of our Bryan will through all the years influence men to greater endeavor in that exalted service.

Feeble and few must be my words of tribute here. So recently upon my cheeks were tears, and I must not invite new flowing of them in the garish light of this public occasion. Perhaps best expression of my thought in this hour, and the thoughts of the multitudes who felt so near to William J. Bryan that they were privileged to regard him as both friend and captain in the army of humanity, may appear in Walt Whitman's lines on the death of his own great captain:

O captain! my captain! our fearful trip is done,  
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won,  
The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting,  
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring;  
But O heart! heart! heart!  
O the bleeding drops of red,  
Where on the deck my captain lies,  
Fallen cold and dead.

O captain! my captain! rise up and hear the bells;  
Rise up—for you the flag is flung—for you the bugle trills,  
For you bouquets and ribbon'd wreaths—for you the shores a-crowding,  
For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning;

Here captain! dear father!  
This arm beneath your head!  
It is some dream that on the deck,  
You've fallen cold and dead.

My captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still,  
My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will,  
The ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done,  
From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won;

Exult O shores, and ring O bells!  
But I with mournful tread,  
Walk the deck my captain lies,  
Fallen cold and dead.

And so, my captain, a fond farewell! Your friendship and love blessed me while you were here upon the earth. Memory of you will be my sweet and comforting companion during the small days till we shall meet again.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent the district in southern Illinois which marks the birthplace of William Jennings Bryan. March 19, 1860, in a small house of five or six rooms, located not far from the public square in Salem, Ill., the man was born who was thrice the standard bearer of his political party and thrice went down to defeat, and who for a time was the premier Cabinet officer in the councils of the Nation when the Democratic Party was in control of the executive departments of our Government. His political career in that respect has no parallel in American history save and except that of Henry Clay, who, too, three times tasted the bitter dregs of defeat as his party leader in national cam-

paigns and likewise headed a Cabinet as Secretary of State. Each in his day in power to sway the masses with oratory was unsurpassed and for long dominating influence within his party has no equal.

When 6 years of age his father and mother moved to a farm of 160 acres about a mile from the village of Salem, where the youth lived, romped, and played and did chores around the farm as was customary with country boys, until he was 15 years of age. Until 10 years of age he learned his lessons at his mother's knee, the public schools until 15, a preparatory course at Whipple Academy, Jacksonville, Ill., a classical course in Illinois College at Jacksonville, followed by a course in Union College of Law, Chicago, constituted his scholastic preparation. He then entered on the practice of law.

He had an ancestral background common to many. His people on both paternal and maternal sides, as far as we are able to trace them, were families of the middle class—neither rich nor poor. They were industrious, frugal, law-abiding, God-fearing people. His ancestral heritage was qualities of the heart, self-reliance, and industry. His father, Silas L. Bryan, a native Virginian, was a most devout man—lawyer, State senator, and judge of the circuit court for 12 years. It is said of his father that regularly three times a day he invoked Divine guidance and permitted nothing to interfere with this custom. Should he be presiding on the bench at his accustomed hour for prayer, he would bow his head in humble supplication. His mother, Elizabeth Jennings, was sincere and devout, with good common sense and high moral conceptions. With these pioneer virtues and qualifications, coupled with a strong individuality and personality, he was equipped for his life's work. His father and mother lie buried in the little cemetery at Salem.

His early training in life made a deep and lasting impression on him, which seemed to grow in intensity and fervor as the years passed. Into his consciousness profound religious concepts and high moral precepts were woven and interwoven. In his famous cross of gold speech an expression well defines his conception of the fitness of things, when he said:

The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of evil.

His faith was the simple, childlike faith that storm nor criticism nor adverse thought could uproot. His indomitable will knew no compromise when once convinced that his course was right. His three dominant characteristics throughout his life were love of religion, love of politics, and love of human kind.

His advocacy of the rights of the common masses, his democratic spirit in thought and action early in his political career gained for him the title of the "Great Commoner." He was unwavering in spirit and determination in the things he thought right. The logic of others could not sway him, the lashings of the waves of criticism, ridicule, and censure seemed but the more firmly to fortify him in his beliefs. His was the spirit of the militant crusader. His power to hold and move audiences was magic. Standing before a great audience he was at his best. Words fell understandingly from his silver tongue on the ears of the common people. His personal following was legion. He went over the heads of the leaders and carried his message to the masses. His friends were ardent, his enemies bitter, perhaps more so than those of any other man in modern public life.

His interest in politics was first awakened in 1872, when his father was a candidate for Congress. Although but 12 years of age, it is said he took a keen boyish interest in the campaign, and the thought and cherished hope of a public career was kindled within him. His first political speech was in the Hancock-Garfield campaign in 1880. The Democratic Hancock-English Club had regular Saturday night meetings. The committee to secure speakers went to Billy Bryan, who had come home from college the night before, and asked him to make a speech the next Saturday night. The now familiar Bryanesque smile spread over his face. He said that he had never made a political speech but that he would try it. In the old courthouse at Salem he spoke for an hour and a half.

I was in rather close contact with him during his late years. It was his custom to return to the scenes of his childhood and meet and converse with his boyhood friends and acquaintances at the annual home-coming and reunion at Salem. That seemed to give him happiness supreme. He never grew away from them nor they from him. Nor did he forget when there to visit his parents' graves and place thereon with loving care and tender memories flowers in token of his love and affection for them.

Although we may not be in accord with all his views on religious matters, on political issues, or on social and moral

problems, I think we will all agree that when the pages of history are written bridging the nineteenth century with the twentieth, of all men who stamped their impress on these eventful years of our Nation's history, William Jennings Bryan will be accorded a place as one of the outstanding figures of the period.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When a young man and studying law in Chicago I learned there was in the city a young man from Nebraska, also a student of law, who had gained some reputation among the students as a speaker, but no one then dreamed that in later years he would be acknowledged to be preeminent as an orator among the platform speakers of his time. I heard nothing more about him for many years. Although he distinguished himself as a speaker in Congress it was not until he was a candidate for President that he became really a national figure. For many years after that event it is doubtful whether there was any man more in the public eye than he. Mr. Bryan occupies a unique position in our history. His powers as an orator were such that no man of his time could attract a larger audience. He had everything that goes into the making of a finished orator—a fine presence, a very distinct utterance, combined with a voice of marvelous carrying power, which enabled him always to reach the farthest of his hearers, and a wonderful facility of expression. His manner on the platform was easy and attractive. No matter how long he spoke none of his hearers left until he had finished, whether or not they finally agreed with him.

Notwithstanding all of these remarkable powers, Mr. Bryan seldom succeeded in carrying into effect the projects which he advocated. I would probably not be an unbiased judge of the reasons which caused him to be unfortunate in this respect, for it was not often that I was in accord with his policies, but anyone who thinks that his life was for that reason a failure is greatly mistaken. Mr. Bryan was from first to last an advocate of the people and he kept their cause constantly before the great body of the voters which must ultimately determine matters of public policy.

There are some that will contend that he was nearly always in error; others that he was nearly always right. I shall not attempt to answer the question as to which of these two views is correct. I will only say that the fact that people were not ready to go as far as he proposed does not prove that his life work had little effect on the course of public events. On the contrary, I think that our governmental action in many respects was profoundly influenced by the course which he took. The rights of the common people were his favorite theme, and the basis of his argument was that these rights had been denied or neglected. Thus he kept constantly in the public mind the principle that the first and greatest duty that the Government owed was to the masses who were unable to protect themselves from the encroachments of those more powerful, either by reason of wealth or circumstances. It was not for nothing that he received the title of the "Great Commoner," for no man was ever better entitled to such a designation, and he was always consistent and insistent in advocating the cause of the common people. No failure could daunt and no reverse could check his advocacy of their cause. From this he derived his power and his following, for there were few that did not concede that he was honest in his purpose and sincerely devoted to his cause. I remember quite well when I was a young man hearing him address a mass convention that had been called at Chicago to consider the question of controlling trusts, as great business organizations of a certain character were then, and still are, denominated. It can not be said that he had very much to do with any legislation that was enacted for the purposes of protecting the people against these organizations, but his speeches had great influence in convincing the people that many of them were harmful, and for that reason that legislation ought to be adopted to control them in the interests of the people.

Mr. Bryan was essentially a crusader, and, as such, at times he seemed to me to have much of the impracticability that so often characterizes the knight errant in the field of politics; but if he had this fault he had also the virtues of the true idealist. At the same time he had all of the enthusiasm of a crusader for the attainment of his purposes and plans, and which he sought to have carried out without using any of the arts of a demagogue. His desire was to make this a land of equal opportunity and to make the common people happy and prosperous. He believed that this could all be accomplished through a general elevation of morals and the attainment of high ideals. He realized that none of his objects could be completely attained as long as the sword constituted the final arbiter in cases of disagreements and quarrels between nations. He therefore sought for world-wide peace as he had sought for industrial peace at home. In this respect he was probably more



successful than in any other, and the arbitration treaties which he succeeded in having ratified while Secretary of State will constitute an enduring monument to his memory.

I doubt whether there has ever been a man in our political history who had at the same time so many devoted followers and so few personal enemies. His eloquence and powers of leadership drew him supporters from every quarter, and his exemplary character and honesty of purpose protected him from enmity. Although so often defeated he was a great leader, an orator of surpassing power and influence, and, perhaps greatest of all, a man of unblemished character and of high purposes. Some will doubtless say that he was much more than this, but this is enough to give him one of the great places in the history of our country.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great honor as well as a great privilege to have the opportunity on this occasion of saying a few words with regard to the life, character, and public services of Mr. Bryan.

Since the campaign of 1896 I have been a devoted follower of Mr. Bryan. For all these years and up to the date of his death he was my political and personal friend, and I appreciated that friendship a very great deal indeed. Mr. Bryan was great in heart, great in mind, and great in Christian character. He was nominated three times for the Presidency by his party and received more than 6,000,000 votes at each election. He probably had a greater personal following than any man in public life in our generation. Indeed, I doubt if any public man in America at any time ever had a greater personal following than he. He contributed more to the passage of progressive legislation than any man, not to have been in office at the time. The income tax and the election of Senators by the people were two reforms that he urged from the beginning of his political career, and saw both of them placed upon the statute books before his death. I heard him speak many times, and at the conclusion of each of his speeches I was so thrilled that I felt that the last speech was the best I had ever heard him deliver. I doubt if our country has ever produced a greater or more effective orator. He had a fine presence, a perfect flow of language, and a wonderful voice. I remember quite well at the St. Louis convention in 1904 when he arose to speak one morning about 6 o'clock, after an all-night session. I was on the outer fringe of the audience. There were probably 15,000 people in the building at the time. I shall never forget the way he started that speech and the effectiveness of it. I never read the speech, but I remember quite well just how he started. He said:

Sixteen hours without sleep and a cold will make it difficult for me to make myself heard.

Yet I heard each syllable and each word in that statement, and I was at the entrance of the building. He followed this statement by saying that he hoped at least the delegates might hear because he wanted especially to talk to the delegates. He continued:

Eight years ago a Democratic National Convention placed in my hands the commission of standard bearer; four years later another Democratic National Convention renewed that commission; I return that commission this morning to this Democratic National Convention. Some of you may dispute whether I have fought a good fight; some of you may dispute whether I have finished my course; but no man can deny that I have kept faith.

This sentence was so effective that that great audience of some 15,000 people applauded him for 31 minutes. I think I have heard most of the orators of our country speak during the last 30 years, and I know that I have never heard such an effective speaker as was Mr. Bryan, and I think his effectiveness flowed largely from the fact that whether or not one agreed with him he was convinced of his absolute honesty and sincerity of purpose. No man in our time has fought more battles and fought them more effectively for the great common people of America than did Mr. Bryan. In fact his whole mature life was made up of one continuous fight in the interest of the masses of our people and in the interest of Christianity. In honoring the memory of this great and good man we do honor to ourselves.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, it is fitting, indeed, that we should set aside this hour to-day to celebrate the birth of America's greatest statesman, William Jennings Bryan.

It is singular, indeed, that he divided his life into four separate and distinct periods. During the first period of his life he devoted himself to education, studies, literature, and letters, and so thorough was his study that he commanded one of the largest and most intelligent vocabularies in the English language. This great command of the English language and his thorough knowledge and familiarity with the Holy Scriptures

were to be his greatest weapons in his future career. Here he laid the foundation for a career which rightfully won for him the right and honor of being named not only the foremost statesman of America, but the greatest orator of his age.

The second period of his life was occupied by the pursuance of his profession—that of law. During this period, we are told, he was quite successful in his profession and built up a lucrative practice.

The third period was, of course, greater than the other two periods, and this period of his life was devoted to the service of his country. Twice elected to Congress and three times the standard bearer of the great Democratic Party, he, in one respect at least, received greater honor than any other man of history, and that was that during his life he received more votes than any other individual in the world. And the reason why the millions of American people flocked to his standard and rallied to the cause which he espoused was because of their belief in him. He was sincere in his motives, zealous in his efforts, and untiring in his labors. In fact, his labors were ceaseless.

He was a man who stood for morals and reforms, and he lived to see four of his great reforms written into the Constitution of the United States, namely, the referendum, the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, prohibition, and women's suffrage. At the time of his demise he had at least one other great reform in view, which was to come as an amendment to the Constitution. This great progressive move, however, was not evolution, yet I do not feel at liberty to state what it was. During this period of his life he traveled in many countries and was received by kings in their palaces, an honor seldom accorded except to those occupying high political office. His great ability and superior statesmanship were recognized throughout the world.

The next period of the life of this great man was the final period, and might well be termed that of service to man and God, and it was at the beginning of this period of his life that he searched for a place of peace, pleasure, health, and spiritual environment in which to reside; and, knowing the world geographically so well as he did, and loving the South which had loved him so much and done so much for him, he chose the southernmost point of the most southern State for his place of abode—Florida.

He built him a magnificent home at Coconut Grove, Fla. When he had been a resident of our great State for only a short while he was induced to become a candidate for member of the Democratic National Convention. He traveled through the State of Florida and spoke with all of his old-time vigor and eloquence, speaking in practically all counties of the State. The people from all walks of life flocked to hear him. Ministers left their studies, professional men left their offices, clerks left their counters, and the farmers left their plowhandles, and the people thronged from far and wide to hear his messages. Six days in the week he discussed before these great audiences the political and economic subjects of the day, and on Sundays he spoke to them on scriptural topics. It was my pleasure and honor to speak with him on many occasions, and these great speeches of his were, as I would term it, valedictories. At the election about 18 months ago he polled more votes than had ever been polled by anyone in my State, and I sincerely believe that the people of Florida had no office too great than for it to have been his for the asking.

But the last days of his life were those of the greatest use. When he had freed himself from political affairs and from all public affairs of state, and each Sunday at his home, beneath the cool shade of the palm trees, in the delightful breeze from the ocean, and in our great soothing climate, taught his large Sunday-school classes and gave his lectures from the Bible to hundreds of thousands of people from all parts of the world, my friends, the life of William Jennings Bryan was undoubtedly an ideal life and worthy of emulation by the American youth.

While William Jennings Bryan was the idol of the American people and polled a total of more votes than any other person in the world, he had his objectors and persecutors. Like the great Napoleon, our own George Washington, Lincoln, Lee, and Woodrow Wilson, and so many others whom the world has called great, he died under fire and great criticism. But his name, deeds, and fine Christian character will ever grow brighter, and he will more and more be admired and safely emulated by the American youth.

The SPEAKER. The hour allotted by the House has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the other gentlemen whose names the Speaker has listed may be recognized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, Bryan was a great man. Bryan was a good man. How can any man say much more about any other man?

It is especially appropriate that in this Chamber, where he first served and where his vibrant voice first caught the ear of the American people, we should make acknowledgment of the splendid contribution which his life and character and his service have made to the life of the Republic.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALENBARGER] has already pointed out how Mr. Bryan, though twice a candidate for the United States Senate and thrice the leader of his party in campaigns for the Presidency, failed to find triumph in any of those campaigns. But, gentlemen, it was in defeat that Bryan was greatest. All of us know how frequently the glare and glitter of a great office obscure the admirable personal qualities of the possessor or blinds the public to them. On the other hand, we all know how often the garish magnificence of high station seems to impart to its possessor qualities that he in truth does not possess. But in defeat, when the tumult and shouting are gone, in the gloom of failure, there is no artificial or adventitious circumstance to give to the defeated contender qualities that he does not possess. There is nothing then to exaggerate or magnify the fallen hero. There is no pomp nor self-seeking flattery to invest him with attributes that fawning sycophancy attributes to the victor. It was in defeat that Bryan was great. Undismayed, unabashed by power, unawed by privilege, and unafraid of consequences or numbers he simply girded himself to fight again for the things in which he believed.

He was not great because he was President. He was greater because he was not President. His was not a reflected glory; it was his own.

For 30 years he was a force in American public life. For one-third of a century he was a leader and a champion. He had his friends and he had his enemies. Many thousands of his own party and distinguished leaders disagreed with him on economics and frequently upon political issues. He had his bitter foes; but through it all, in defeat and in temporary triumph, in peace and in battle, Bryan was always Bryan—sincere, courageous, and militant. Regardless of whether his friends or his enemies agreed with him, all acknowledged his power and respected his character.

There are two contributions to English literature that have lived through the years as eloquent tributes of the living to the dead. Lord Tennyson in his poem *In Memoriam* pours out, perhaps, the noblest tribute that one friend ever paid to another, and Thomas Gray in his *Elegy in a Country Church Yard* singles out amidst that humble and obscure burial place the fancied heroes which walked in his mind. You will remember that he stopped at one grave and said:

Some village Hampden that with dauntless breast  
The little tyrant of his fields withstood.

My friends, the poet of the future, if he could but pause at the grave yonder in Arlington, might say with Tennyson that here lies the friend of all humanity, and with Thomas Gray, here lies a Hampden, not of some village, but a Hampden who spoke for the inhabitants of all the villages and all the cities and all the lands everywhere on this earth, and who withstood not simply the little tyrant of the fields but withstood the tyrants, big as well as little, of all the lands and of all the industries on this earth.

He sleeps yonder in Arlington, where the great and the gallant and the bravest and the best shall sleep in glory through all the years. Let me close with that line of Tennyson's—

God's finger touched him, and he slept.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, of course any man on an occasion like this would be indeed proud if he could say something excellent and elegant and eloquent, but sometimes the simplest words are the best. A great and probably the greatest of the American orators once said:

The elocutionist believes in the virtue of the voice and the genius of gesture and the symmetry of syntax and the majesty of long sentences, but the real and true orator believes in the real and the truth.

By this test William Jennings Bryan was a real, true orator. I have always been impressed with that fact every time I have heard or have read one of his speeches, and, animated by that desire, I want the few words I say to you here to-day to be simplicity itself.

I knew him so long and so well in the days of boyhood and youth that emotion and sentiment combine to make me feel I really ought to stand aside, especially after the magnificent things that have this day fallen from the lips of the splendid orators of this House.

I would not take your time if it were not that there is at the home in Miami now a gentle and a generous lady, a gracious and graceful American woman, whom I knew in her girlhood back in Jacksonville, Ill., when we all called her "Bryan's sweetheart," destined to animate and inspire one of the noblest figures that ever stood in the forefront of the Nation's life. After years of suffering, she sits there now spiritualized by that deep affection which will abide forever. I would hate to have this meeting close without having her know we thought of her in this hour.

Now, just a few words, if you please, about old Jacksonville in Illinois and the time when Bryan was there. There is a little old verse which says:

Something of their greatness lingers  
Where great men have dwelt;  
Something of their high resolving  
In the changing years revolving  
Not by weaklings felt.

I am glad that it is appropriate for me to say a word about William Jennings Bryan, whom I have known since 1875. I knew him from 1875 to 1890 as well, perhaps, as any man here. I had the honor of serving as one of the 25 honorary pallbearers at Washington last year.

#### THE BRYAN BOY WHO CAME FROM SALEM

He graduated in 1881. He came up from his birthplace, Salem, Ill., in 1875 to join the preparatory department of Illinois College, called Whipple Academy. He boarded at the home of his uncle, Dr. Hiram K. Jones. Doctor Jones belonged to the Concord Summer School of Philosophy. He was an associate and well-known friend of Emerson and truly a man of learning. Reading Greek in the original, he was a profound student of Plato. He was distinguished and eminent as a physician. He was the family physician of my parents. My mother was an invalid in 1875, made so because she insisted in attending every day of the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson in 1868, when my father was a Senator of the United States, and therefore one of the judges at that trial. On a certain day, just as the doctor was about to leave after a professional call, which always inculcated the majesty of calmness, he said: "Mrs. Yates, a nephew of mine is coming up from Salem, Ill., next week to go to school here, and I want my boy and your boy to know each other." I heard this and was on the watch and was, I feel sure, one of the first to welcome the Great Commoner to the college precincts.

#### BRYAN STRENUOUS IN YOUTH

In connection with Bryan, I recall another hour in that same room of my mother.

There came on, in 1875, the annual contest in "Elocution"—not oratory or the new-fangled word "expression," but "elocution," first prize \$15, second prize, \$10. The faculty selected the 10 contestants—decided who the speakers or declaimers should be. But the selecting of a hall, the hiring of the orchestra, the inviting of the young ladies to sing between the declamations, the contracting for the printing of the programs, the nominating of the ushers, the arranging of the stage—all these important details were left to the anxious contestants, who would pardon no missteps. The contestants held a meeting and honored Bryan and me with the distinction of attending to these things; no pair of modern ambassadors and no team of imperial legates of old could have felt the importance more keenly. And yet, such was the simplicity of the time; the meeting to round up all these things occurred in my mother's room at a little round marble-topped table at the foot of her bed, she reclining there, but not interrupting the "ambassadors." After the meeting and the departure of William J., my mother said, "Oh, dear, I wish you had the energy and iron will of that boy; he will go far."

#### A PRIZE CONTEST IN "ELOCUTION."

The annual prize contest for elocution, aforesaid, came off in old Conservatory Hall before a capacity audience. All the sweethearts were there. And, of course, all the professors and old boys. The declamations were heroic indeed. The Sigma Pi Society, to which Bryan and I both belonged, cheered us to the echo. But the judges were wonderfully benighted. Bryan and I were both defeated. The first prize, \$15, went to a boy named Merrill, the second to a boy named Harsha. Bryan declaimed Patrick Henry's celebrated speech, "Give me liberty or give me death," while I recited, "Supposed speech of John Adams"—

... I leave off as I began, that live or die, survive or perish, I am for the declaration. It is my living sentiment, and by the blessing of God it shall be my dying sentiment, independence now and independence forever—



which, after all, is good doctrine yet. I felt that Bryan was simply sublime as he shouted, "Gentlemen cry, 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace." (One of the judges comforted Bryan next day by telling him that had there been a third prize, Bryan would have got it.) Later we both had better luck. (Bryan in his junior year triumphed at the junior oratorical contest and later won a prize at the State contest, participated in by 10 colleges; and so did I.) I have in my hand the old program of that old Conservatory Hall contest, 50 years ago.

## PROGRAM

## MUSIC

## PRAYER

## MUSIC

1. Oration on Turenne.....Esprit Flechier  
T. F. Smith, Macomb, Ill.
2. Supposed Speech of John Adams.....Daniel Webster  
Richard Yates, Jacksonville, Ill.
3. Three Days in the Life of Columbus.....Delavigne  
H. W. Johnston, Rushville, Ill.  
Song—Should He Upbraid?.....Bishop  
Miss M. E. Ormond.
4. Lucius Junius Brutus' Oration Over the Body of  
Lucretia.....John H. Payne  
Walter G. Scott, Jacksonville, Ill.
5. Speech of Patrick Henry.....Patrick Henry  
W. Bryan, Salem, Ill.
6. Misanthrope.....Anonymous  
A. K. Harsha, Jacksonville, Ill.  
Song—The Captive Greek Girl.....Hobbs  
Miss M. E. Ormond.
7. Regulus to the Roman Senate.....Regulus  
F. McKinnell, Beardstown, Ill.
8. Spartacus to the Roman Envoys in Etruria.....E. Kellogg  
E. G. Merrill, Keeseville, N. Y.
9. Address to the Young Men of Italy.....Mazzini  
W. W. Hillix, Weston, Mo.

## MUSIC

## Announcement of Prizes.

## Order of the program arranged by lot.

I wonder if it would be indelicate—I hope you will not feel it so—for me to tell you that just before he went to Nebraska he met me on the street one day and asked me to come down to his office that night. This was after we had been admitted to the bar some six or seven years and had been separately practicing law in Jacksonville, Ill. His office consisted of a desk in a corner of the office of the law firm of Brown & Kirby, and my office consisted of a desk in the corner of the law office of Morrison & Whitlock. Neither of us was rich enough to have an office of his own. A great thing developed at that evening meeting, for he tendered me a partnership. At first glance it had every appearance of success because he was a Democrat and I a Republican; he was a Presbyterian and I a Methodist; he lived in one end of town and I lived in the other; he had his overdraft with one bank and I had mine with another. All went well, even as to the firm name. It was unanimously agreed, there being no minority report, that the firm name ought to be "Bryan & Yates" and not "Yates & Bryan," but a slight difference in regard to the division of the next year's fees prevented that partnership, and I have never got over that one of my numerous mistakes. I saw him in Chicago when he came to have breakfast with me at the Auditorium Hotel one morning not long before he passed away. Mrs. Yates was there, and he said to Mrs. Yates, "If your husband had accepted that partnership, I would still be practicing law in Jacksonville, Morgan County, Ill." I said, "No; you would not. You would have been William Jennings Bryan wherever you were in all the world, and as long as you lived in America you would be running for President with one great party in one hand and another great party in the other hand." He said, "You are a fatalist." I said, "I am not a fatalist, but I know William Jennings Bryan."

Departing as I well know from the high standard of oratory that has been set by you gentlemen this afternoon, may I tell you one more very personal incident?

Bryan and I were standing at the entrance to a Chautauqua tent in western Nebraska or eastern Colorado. He was waiting for an automobile to take him at about 5 o'clock p. m. to his next appointment, his date for that evening, at a town 90 miles west and south. It was 90 miles I well know for I covered the same 90 myself the next day. He had just lectured 2 hours and 40 minutes, from 2 p. m. to 4.40 p. m., and had already traveled 65 miles through a heavy rain storm from 8 to 12 that morning.

He was hoarse and perspiring and as tired as any man could be, and therefore not in a mood, I am sure, for any strain of sentiment or emotion.

All of a sudden a boy of 16, employed as one of the tent boys of the Chautauqua agency or bureau which owned the tent and "properties," rushed up to me and said: "Oh, Governor Yates, I am going to do it; I don't know how I can manage it, and I don't see a thing in sight, but I am going to try it; I am going to do it."

I said to the colonel: "Oh, Bryan, look, look here, and see this boy; this brave, bright boy; he told me in Kansas that he is crazy to go to college, but feared he must give it up because he had not been able to save any money."

I may add that the boy's face was aflame with enthusiasm, radiant with resolution, flushed with aspiration. This conversation ensued:

Colonel BRYAN. What does your father do?

Boy. Well, it doesn't matter does it?

BRYAN. Yes; I want to know; what does he do; is he a farmer?

Boy. Yes, sir.

BRYAN. Can he help you?

Boy. No, sir; not at all.

BRYAN. Would a hundred dollars do you any good?

I thought the boy would faint. He swallowed and stammered and choked and the tears came into his eyes and he could not say a word. And Bryan said, "Here, give me my check," and the treasurer handed him a check and Bryan looked at it and said, "\$99," and turned it over and indorsed it in blank and reached down in his pocket and got a silver dollar and handed both to the boy—the check and the dollar—and said:

"Here, take this, and God bless you," and climbed into his automobile and, like Santa Claus of old, "drove out of sight," leaving a youth in tears—and I cried a little, too.

The situation could almost have been described in the dear old words,

But I heard him exclaim as he drove out of sight,  
Merry Christmas to all, and to all a good night.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are doing today a very unusual thing. I do not recall that at any time since the Civil War, surely I know that at no time during my service in the House of Representatives, has the House ever fixed an hour to pay tribute of respect to persons who were not in official life at the time of their death, except in the case of two former Presidents of the United States. But although we are doing an unusual thing I am sure we all of us feel that we are doing a very proper thing because the life of Hon. William Jennings Bryan was for a period of 30 years so intimately and prominently connected with the public affairs of these United States as that it is quite proper for us on this anniversary of his birth to devote this hour to recollections of him.

I can not claim such an intimacy with Mr. Bryan as many of those who have preceded me were able to claim. My first meeting with him was in the year 1896, the year of his first candidacy for the Presidency and the year when I cast my first vote. It was a mere casual meeting; nothing occurred that would have caused him to retain me in his recollection. During subsequent years I saw him occasionally, sometimes frequently, particularly while he was here as Secretary of State, but I repeat that the associations although cordial, were never what could be termed intimate.

For 30 years Mr. Bryan held dominion in the hearts and over the intellects of unnumbered millions of American people. As has been said by a number of speakers who have preceded me, that dominion was perhaps greater than has been held by any other citizen, unless, perhaps, it was the late President Roosevelt, within the last 50 years. His was a most remarkable career. Henry Clay held dominion for a long while, but Henry Clay was in public life for a long while. Jackson held dominion for a long while, but Jackson was in public life for a long while. Jefferson and others of earlier days held dominion but those almost without exception were in public life for a long while. Lincoln, of course, held dominion and it continues to grow as the years go by, and Lincoln, as I had occasion to say the other day, was really in public life so far as national affairs were concerned, for only a very brief time—one term in Congress and one term as President of the United States. Bryan was in a national official position just two terms in the House of Representatives and a little more than two years as Secretary of State.

But during all that period, from the time of his first nomination for President until the conclusion of his life, while he suffered defeat within the lines of his own party, it is not

putting it too strong to say that he was the most powerful single individual with the people that there was in the party.

The closest association that I ever had with Mr. Bryan was during what may be properly designated as his last really great political appearance. It so happened that at the Democratic convention in New York in 1924 I had the honor of being a member of the committee on platform and resolutions, and by the chairman of that committee, Mr. Cummings, I was appointed a member of the subcommittee of which Mr. Bryan was also a member and of which he was the vice chairman. That subcommittee, after its first day's work, began to realize that forces were playing about that convention that not only threatened the success of our party but which some of us began to fear threatened the very continuance of our party, and for more than four days the subcommittee sat trying to extend its influence and its suggestions out to the floor of the convention in order to prevent what again and again seemed to us might prove the very dissolution of our party. Out of 72 hours the members of that subcommittee had just 13 hours of sleep. I recall that one morning, at I think about 3 o'clock, when we had adjourned from the committee room and were passing up to the hotel where Mr. Bryan was stopping, he said to me, "This, of course, will be the last convention that I shall ever attend." I asked him, "Why?" And he said, "I do not expect to be living when the next national convention meets; in fact, I doubt if I shall be living a year from now." That was prophecy, because he died in a little more than a year from that time.

It may seem strange to refer to the incident which I have now in mind, but I shall refer to it because it was so characteristic of Mr. Bryan's life and his philosophy. It occurred on the last morning after the subcommittee had been in session all night, when it seemed inevitable that the question which was so troubling us would bring about the disintegration of our party. We had abandoned by that time all hope of Democratic success at the election which was to follow, and our sole thought was bent then upon the idea of trying to preserve the party from dissolution. Just about daybreak of the morning of the fourth day—I think it was the 28th of June—there occurred what I imagine was one of the most dramatic incidents that ever happened in any committee of a political convention in the history of these United States or of the world. Mr. Bryan offered a prayer. I have a copy of that prayer here and I think I shall read it, though it had been my purpose merely to insert it in the Record without reading. It illustrates, as I said a while ago, his spirit and his philosophy. He believed in political matters being religious, although he did not believe in inserting religion as a political issue into the affairs of government.

The prayer reads as follows:

Our Heavenly Father, we come into Thy presence conscious that Thou art infinite in wisdom, love, and power, while we are limited in knowledge and prone to err.

Thou dost care for Thy children and hast promised to reveal Thyself and Thy will to those whose hearts are open to divine suggestion.

We need Thy counsel, Lord. We are carrying great responsibilities and dealing with mighty problems that vex and trouble us. We are subject to prejudice and passion and unconscious bias.

Cleanse our minds of all unworthy thoughts and purge our hearts of all evil desires. Show us Thy ways and help us to know what Thou wouldst have us say and do and be.

We would consecrate ourselves wholly unto Thee and Thy service. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Help us to advance in our day and this day the brotherhood Thou didst establish; may it include all mankind.

So guide and direct us in our work to-day that the people of our party and of our country and of the world may be better for our coming together in this convention and in this committee.

Bless us not for ourselves, but that we may be a blessing. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

I repeat, it is singular perhaps to insert this in the Record; but if any of you had been in the atmosphere of that committee room, if you could have appreciated the tremendous strain under which that little group was laboring there in an effort to save from dissolution and disintegration the party which we believed was best equipped for saving mankind, if you could have gotten the atmosphere of the hour, I am sure it would have impressed you, as it did all of us who were there, as one of the most dramatic episodes that ever happened in the history of politics.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, it fell to my lot to arrange this program to-day, and because of the fact that so many gentlemen expressed a desire to speak I have had to deny some we would have been very glad to hear from; but we have two Members of the House whom I consider among our best beloved

and qualified to speak to us upon this occasion. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the House grant the privilege of five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in order that they may address us on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I had not intended to say anything because I am aware that I can add nothing to the deserved and beautiful tributes that have already been paid to my friend Mr. Bryan. As I sat in my seat listening to these addresses I became in a reminiscent mood. My mind went back to the Fifty-second Congress, in 1891, the first Congress to which Mr. Bryan was elected. After a memorable contest my father was elected Speaker of that House. Mr. Bryan had not supported him in the Democratic caucus for the speakership nomination but had loyally supported his friend Mr. Springer, of Illinois. Mr. Bryan was young, handsome, energetic, enthusiastic, and magnetic. Some of his friends, notably Mr. Springer, of Illinois, were urging him for appointment on the Committee on Ways and Means. After considering the pros and cons, notwithstanding he had not supported father in his speakership contest, notwithstanding it was Mr. Bryan's first term in Congress, my father appointed him on that committee. He was subjected to some criticism by his own colleagues for doing so. As a mere boy I was clerk at the Speaker's table. Part of the duties of that office at that time was to keep the time of the various speakers. A tariff bill was under consideration. Finally Mr. Bryan was recognized. He stood in the aisle along about where my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORIN] now stands, at the second or third row of seats from the back of the Chamber. He started to address the House on the tariff. At first he was given very little attention, but after a few moments he had won the House and he had its undivided attention. When he was called down at the expiration of his one hour, dozens of Members on both sides of the House rose and asked unanimous consent that he be given unlimited time, which was done. He continued to enthral and enlighten the House for 2 hours and 45 minutes and that was the speech that brought Mr. Bryan first into national prominence.

When that speech was over my father said to me: "That speech justifies my appointment of Mr. Bryan on the Ways and Means Committee, and there will be no further criticism of that appointment," and there was none.

Mr. Bryan was ever my friend from the day I first knew him as a boy in the Fifty-second Congress. Father died in October, 1896, before Mr. Bryan became the nominee of the party for President. When Mr. Bryan was Secretary of State he repeatedly said to me that he could never do anything for father who gave him his first opportunity, but that if there was anything in the world that he could ever do for me to repay father's friendship for him, he stood ready and willing and anxious to do it.

I never had occasion to call upon him, and I simply give this to show the bigness of character of Mr. Bryan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bryan has ended his earthly career, but his influence is not dead. His great character, his great public service radiated from him influences for good, for clean government, for clean living, for faith in the Christianity of our fathers that will endure for all time to bless unborn American generations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those who visit the beautiful Arlington National Cemetery, just across the Potomac River, are struck by three outstanding and conspicuous features. The first is the home of Robert E. Lee, one of the purest and perhaps the greatest military leader of all history.

Another is the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, whose sacred sarcophagus contains the composite embodiment of all our honored dead who made the supreme sacrifice in the World War.

The third is the new-made grave of William Jennings Bryan, the greatest Christian leader of modern times.

His enduring fame is evidenced already by the fact that admiring humanity has made such a beaten path to his grave that it has become necessary to wire off a passage to it in order to keep them from trampling upon the graves in the surrounding grounds.

Great as a statesman, great as an American, he was even greater as a moral, Christian leader. He needs no epitaph save his own immortal name, which is indelibly inscribed on the hearts of his fellow men. He needs no monument save the "indestructible substance of his own greatness" to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. He needs no biography save that written by his own eloquence. In answer



to one of the leading unbelievers of his day, he gave to America the richest contribution to her inspiring literature, in which he said:

And immortality! Who will estimate the peace which a belief in a future life has brought to the sorrowing hearts of the sons of men?

If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn and to make it burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, made in the image of his Creator? If he stoops to give to the rose-bush, whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another spring time, will He refuse the words of hope to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the imperial spirit of man suffer annihilation when it has paid a brief visit like a royal guest to this tenement of clay? No; I am sure that He who, notwithstanding His apparent prodigality, created nothing without a purpose, and wasted not a single atom in all His creation, has made provision for a future life in which man's universal longing for immortality will find its realization. I am as sure that we live again as I am sure that we live to-day.

In Cairo I secured a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than 30 centuries in an Egyptian tomb. As I looked at them this thought came into my mind: If one of those grains had been planted on the banks of the Nile the year after it grew and all its lineal descendants had been planted and replanted from that time until now, its progeny would to-day be sufficiently numerous to feed the teeming millions of the world. An unbroken chain of life connects the earliest grains of wheat with the grains that we sow and reap. There is in the grain of wheat an invisible something which has power to discard the body that we see, and from earth and air fashion a new body so much like the old one that we can not tell the one from the other. If this invisible germ of life in the grain of wheat can thus pass unimpaired through 3,000 resurrections, I shall not doubt that my soul has power to clothe itself with a body suited to its new existence when this earthly frame has crumbled into dust.

JOHN C. COOLIDGE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, to-day there has come news of the death of a simple citizen of the Nation—news that has carried its sad message to all parts of the world. Col. John C. Coolidge has been a resident of my district all his long life. I have known him personally for more than 30 years. To know him was to admire his sterling qualities of heart and mind and to have an abiding respect for his character.

He came of a people who put duty and patriotism above all else. Colonel Coolidge was a great man, when measured by the yardstick that truly determines the real value of citizenship. He was of the type that founded the Republic and nourished its existence.

His example of simple living, hard work, and honest dealing has had a wholesome influence on millions of his fellow countrymen.

Though he has passed from the sphere of active physical existence, who can doubt that he still lives in the fine traits of character passed on to his honored son, the President of the United States? [Applause.]

#### LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10425, the legislative appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10425, the legislative appropriation bill, with Mr. HAWLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10425, the legislative appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10425) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is recognized.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not suppose there is a subject pending before the American Congress upon which we could have the unanimous action of Congress any easier than we could on the subject of farm relief if the Members of Congress could agree upon what would afford farm relief.

I have not much patience with the statement which goes out, to the effect that Congress will not do anything for the farmer. I do not believe that there is a Member of this House, regardless of his location, regardless of the district that he represents, but who, if he honestly believed that the enactment of a sound measure into law would benefit agriculture under existing conditions, would vote for that law.

There is a report going out from Washington—I am not charging motives to the people who are putting out that report—that Congress is not willing to do anything for agriculture. I want to give you a little history showing what the work of the Committee on Agriculture has been at this session of Congress, to let you see just how far from easy it is to arrive at a proper solution of the farmer's problem. Out at Des Moines, Iowa, they had a convention. The governors of 11 States appointed 2 delegates each to attend that convention, and in that way they formed a committee of 22, coming from what is called the Corn Belt, because the situation in the Corn Belt is distressing.

During the war the prices of land were so inflated that in the State of Iowa, for instance, they paid \$400 or \$500 or \$600 an acre for farm land and went into debt for most of it, and the banks got that paper. That paper is not good security, because the soil of Iowa will not produce crops sufficient to pay the interest on the loan, and there is no way to compel the people who put the paper in the bank to pay it, and it never will be paid, because there is not the security behind the paper.

However, agriculture has not had a fair deal since the war, due to the fact that agriculture has not been able to organize as has industry and labor and procure for itself what they have procured for themselves; and that is due to the fact that certain laws that we have passed can not be made to apply to agriculture as effectively.

Let me tell you what I know about the bills pending before us. One bill from a colleague, pending before this committee—I will talk about it later—proposes to create a commission and fix the price of all farm products so that they will pay 5% per cent as profit on the cost of production. I do not know how in the world you will fix that, when they produce 40 bushels an acre on land costing \$600 an acre in Iowa and give them 5% per cent profit. We will do all right in Kansas producing the same amount of corn on land that costs \$50 an acre. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is not a boy's program of work. Of course, that bill was introduced by an enthusiastic Congressman from Kansas for the edification of his constituents. [Laughter.]

But he will go home next summer and howl up and down the valleys as to what he would have been willing to do for agriculture if he could have gotten the other boys to go along with him. [Applause.]

A corn committee came here. Twenty-two of them came here. They were well represented, and they were a pretty nice looking bunch of men. Remember it was the price of corn that was hurting. The price of corn was not right, and it was the price of corn that was hurting. They came before our Committee on Agriculture and admitted it was the price of corn that was out of line, because the price of every other agricultural product was away above normal peace-time prices, and the price was satisfactory to the people producing those products. They came here and said, "Now, we are going to formulate for this committee a bill that is workable and a thing which you can enact into law." And they testified. Let me say for the Committee on Agriculture, and let no man deny it—I am not defending myself; I do not expect to come back to Congress, and the reason I do not expect to come back is that I do not want to, and that is the only reason. So I am talking for the great committee with which I have worked for eight years, and I know that committee does more conscientious hard work—I will not say more but as much as any committee in this House—and they have been doing it for the whole of these eight years. There never has been a day that these men wanted to appear before that committee and testify but what the committee was ready to hear them. And it had to hurry them to get them to come with their plan. We have

had to prod them. They came here and they went to see the President and then somebody else. Finally they came before that committee, and we said, "Now, get your plan in workable order; we want to see if we can do anything for you."

Let me stop right here to say that a remark was made on this floor yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Dickinson] to the effect that somebody told him he could get the relief he was seeking if he could get the indorsement of the President, and if the President would come down here and say to the committee, "You vote out that bill," and if he did that it would be voted out on the floor. Let me tell you that is not true. The men who sit on that committee, most of them, have been there a good many years and they listen to the testimony; they are familiar with the subject, and there has never been a time since I have been in the House that the Committee on Agriculture has sacrificed its beliefs and its principles in voting on legislation. They would never do that by order from anyone, even if they did receive it. [Applause.]

I do not believe the gentleman who made that assertion would sacrifice his, and that was a funny thing, too. It is kind of remarkable that the gentleman who said that to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Dickinson] is against his bill. The gentleman from Iowa wants a certain bill passed. He has had the courage to introduce it and say this is my plan and I stand for it, but the man who said that to him and told him how to get his plan passed is against his plan and he is fighting it every day in the committee. Do not let us make any bones about it. His prescription to the gentleman from Iowa for getting his bill passed and having it enacted into law is to get the President or somebody else indorse it and ask for its passage.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am against it, and I have been consistent on it; but will the gentleman from Kansas say he is against it? The gentleman from Kansas was for the McNary-Haugen bill when his wheat growers were in trouble, but when the corn people got into trouble he was against it.

Mr. TINCHER. I will state to the gentleman who interrupted me, not to ask a question but to make a speech on the floor of the House, as he always does, that I have not been inconsistent at all. I supported the McNary-Haugen bill because I believed there was an emergency that needed help, and I have never fought anything that has ever come from the great Committee on Agriculture since I have been on it, and you have not supported anything.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TINCHER. No; I do not want to get into any controversy with the gentleman. If you have anything to enlighten this House, wait until I am through and then take the floor, like you are always doing in the committee, and be sarcastic about it and slur somebody, because that is your style.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will you say you are for the Dickinson bill or are you against it?

Mr. TINCHER. I have never said I was for it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. You are against it, and yet it is the same in principle as the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. TINCHER. Let me tell you something, something which, of course, you do not understand; and there are plenty of men in the House who know that. I am not getting up here before the House and declaring what bill I am for, but I am trying to work out a bill for agriculture. I am defending the Committee on Agriculture, and most of the members of that committee are entitled to the defense. They do not try every five minutes to inject some petty political issue into every bit of work they are doing. Most of them are too big and high-class men for that.

Now, I started to tell you about these fellows with their corn plans, and I want to tell you what the committee got up against outside of internal troubles and, God knows, some committees have enough of those troubles, and we have had our internal troubles. A committee of 22 came down here; the Corn Belt fellows. They said, "We want you to write a law." We told them to take advantage of the drafting service and prepare the bill they wanted the committee to consider. We called attention to the fact that there was not anything concrete in their indorsement. They did not indorse the Dickinson bill; they indorsed the principle; but they said they were not indorsing it. However, we said, "Write your bill and bring it in." And the amazing thing was that they went out and wrote a bill creating a board and authorizing that board to take care of surplus crops and defining the basic agricultural products of America. They did that on page 9 of that bill.

The bill is a peculiar one. You can not get copies of it, but there is a committee print. It has no father or mother. [Laughter.] Here is what it says:

Whenever the board finds that there may be during the year ensuing a surplus above domestic requirements of cotton, wheat, cattle, or swine—

Then they go on and provide for the collection of an equalization fee. Now, do you know what was wrong with those men? They would have this American Congress go on record voting a definition for the basic agricultural products and leave corn out, and they come down here to get help—

Mr. MADDEN. Why were they opposed to corn?

Mr. TINCHER. I will tell you why, Mr. MADDEN. They were afraid to advocate an equalization fee on corn. I supported the McNary-Haugen bill, but there was no concealment in any paragraph of it. We advocated an equalization fee on all the products and gave the plan whereby we proposed to raise it. But here is an outfit that brought in a bill, and while over in the back of it they take \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury for corn, yet the wheat fellow and the cotton fellow and the hog fellow and the cattle fellow must get his money from the equalization fee.

They knew it would not work. They knew it was a proposition that was impracticable, but they were afraid to go back to their corn raisers and say they had not stood for this, so they come in here with this bill and leave corn out of it, and Peek and his crowd, you know who they are—

Mr. MADDEN. They wanted \$100,000,000 for corn, but wanted the other products to take care of themselves through the equalization fee.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; and eventually take care of the corn.

It is from that crowd that the news emanates that the administration and the Congress will not do anything for agriculture.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Is the gentleman willing to use his influence with this Congress to have it stay in session until we can get a relief bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture which will be a bill indorsed by your committee and one that has your approval?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly. I am willing to have hearings day and night. I forced a roll call in the committee this morning so we would work to-morrow on hearings. I am going to cooperate with the boys to report out a bill that is workable and one that will meet the situation. I am not willing to play politics with the men who come down here 22 strong and howl for corn legislation and then go out and report back to the American Congress and ask us by solemn vote to leave King Corn out of a definition of basic agricultural products. I am not willing to do that. You put corn in your bill and put an equalization fee on it.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And I am willing to have it stay there, Brother TINCER, and I recommend now that your committee give that consideration.

Mr. TINCHER. But here is what happened to us. Mr. Hirth, from Missouri, spoke four days, and do you know what the closing remarks of his speech were?

Gentlemen, we have had this up in our meetings; we have had these caucuses. We, the farmers, have gone over this matter, and here is this bill; you take it; and if you do not pass it, you do so at your peril.

Can we change it any? No. They say, "This is the bill we want. We have come and gone and made the demand."

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly.

Mr. BURTNESS. I would like to read the gentleman a wire and get his comment upon it, because it pertains particularly to the Committee on Agriculture and its handling of this question.

Mr. TINCHER. Read it.

Mr. BURTNESS. It comes from the Wheat Growers Purchasing Co., whose offices are at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

In your opinion has the Congress been intimidated by the methods and testimony of members of the Des Moines Conference Committee in presenting the farm problem before the House Agricultural Committee, or is reaction of certain members of the committee result of previous determination not to sincerely grapple with situation demanding immediate action? Reply for publication.

Mr. TINCHER. You wire them that nobody was intimidated. Tell them that this committee is made up of men who have fights every day, like KINCHELOE and myself, and that there is not anybody out in the Northwest who could intimidate anybody on this committee. [Laughter and applause.] Tell him if it was meant for that purpose it was a failure.

We are seriously working every day. I never worked with the committee when it worked any harder than it has been working this year, and it has always been a hard-working



committee. The committee is trying to arrive at something that is workable.

Mr. BURNETT. There are two questions, apparently, in this wire. Your answer is no to the first one. Is it also no to the second question?

Mr. TINCER. What is the second question?

Mr. BURNETT (reading)—

Is reaction of certain members of the committee result of previous determination not to sincerely grapple with situation demanding immediate action?

Mr. TINCER. I object to that as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial; and nobody on earth can tell what is meant. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Apparently, however, press agents have been at work and have created considerable confusion in the minds of the people, and I thought probably the gentleman could straighten out the situation.

Mr. TINCER. Well, when they come here one day demanding you do something for corn, and then they go out the next day and come back with a bill that has nothing about corn in it, it makes you kind of shaky about this committee of 22.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. We have a very distinguished citizen in the State from which I come who has taken a lot of interest in agriculture, former Governor Lowden, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas what remedy the governor suggested for the ills of the farmer when before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TINCER. You know that is embarrassing [laughter], because I like Frank Lowden, and I may be sorry for this some time.

Mr. MADDEN. I have great confidence in his judgment.

Mr. TINCER. He made one of the greatest speeches I ever heard. He shed tears, but he did not offer any suggestions. [Laughter and applause.] He is just like many more of them. You ought to get that speech, MARTIN, and read it. It is one of the finest you ever read in your life, but it stops short of suggestions. You understand, it will be dangerous in the great State of Illinois for a really ambitious man to advocate an equalization fee on corn.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, Illinois is a great corn State. I was wondering about his position, because I am very anxious to follow the suggestions of our former governor.

Mr. TINCER. I do not believe Frank would be in favor of putting this fee on wheat either, because if he should ever run he would want the Kansas delegation.

Mr. MADDEN. Frank raises cotton, too.

Mr. TINCER. I do not know, but he might take Meredith's plan. Meredith came here from Iowa and testified an entire day. He is a great friend of the farmer. He gave us his testimony and finally gave us a proposed bill, but he came out square-toed and said, "I am for price fixing; I have got away from all this fictitious notion that we do not want price fixing. We want price fixing." Mr. Meredith has also given us his list of prices which he would fix in the bill, and there was a funny thing about that. Every agricultural product has a higher price to-day than he gave us except two, cotton and sugar. [Laughter and applause.] He was going to double the price of cotton and sugar, and the rest of it would come down lower.

Mr. MADDEN. Double the price of corn in order to make sugar.

Mr. TINCER. I wish we could make all the sugar we import out of corn.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the way, squeeze the juice out of corn and make sugar out of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to encumber the Record with this thing, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the bill in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINCER. I want the membership to study that and see if you are going to criticize the committee for not reporting it out. Do you know what this committee tried to do, this committee of equalization fee? They were going to put the equalization fee on process flour, going to make the miller pay it. It was said before the committee that probably the farmer would never have to pay it. Oh, they are brave, this committee that originated in Des Moines. There are only two or three brave men in it. They saw what was going on and they went

home—the two members from Kansas. They are against the proposition.

A MEMBER. They went home to run for Congress. [Laughter.] Mr. TINCER. Well, there may be something in that. The fellow that was going to run for Congress would not be for an equalization fee; but you have either got to raise the money by an equalization fee or, if you have the Dickinson plan, by taking it out of the Treasury.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I am for the fee on every commodity in the bill.

Mr. TINCER. The gentleman is not for refusing recognition of King Corn?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. He is the pride of my life. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCER. Now, gentlemen, you ought to read this and see what that Des Moines committee was willing to do. They said it is not a tax. The proponents before the committee said this is not to be a tax. Mr. Hirth said, "I think it is unfair for you to refer to the equalization fee as a tax; it is not a tax." I said to him, "What makes you think the bill is constitutional?" "Mr. Murphy said it was constitutional, and he is a good lawyer." Well, he said, "They got under the commerce clause and the tax law both." I said, "Out in my State a man sells a bushel of wheat and it is ground into flour and the miller pays the equalization fee. That is not interstate commerce; how do you reach that under the Constitution?" They said, "Under the taxing power." They levy it as an equalization fee, but do not want you to call it a tax.

In 1924 we exported 13,000,000 barrels of flour, and last year about half that much. I am told that by men who ought to know. Now, if they had to pay the equalization fee on that, something a little less than 70,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the same year we exported 166,000,000 bushels of raw wheat and there is no equalization fee on that. The same thing would be true of hogs and cattle. And then they find fault with the committee because it does not take that bill when half of the proponents have not been heard. There are still some people to be heard against the bill after we have heard all those supporting it.

Now, this is not the only bill before the committee. We have before it H. R. 9561, introduced by Mr. OLDFIELD, of Arkansas. It is a big bill, a comprehensive bill; it covers 10 pages. I do not suppose you have read it, have you Mr. OLDFIELD? [Laughter.] Are you going to ask for hearings on it?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Oh, yes.

Mr. TINCER. Is the gentleman for the bill?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes. Mr. Vrooman is going to be heard on it.

Mr. TINCER. Yes; I understood he wrote it. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLDFIELD. I understood the gentleman from Kansas agreed with Mr. Vrooman.

Mr. TINCER. I might have been pleasant to Mr. Vrooman.

Mr. OLDFIELD. The gentleman is opposed to the bill, is he?

Mr. TINCER. I would not say that I am opposed to it until we hold the hearings. Knowing the eloquence of the gentleman from Arkansas, and appreciating his power, and being one of the judges who shall vote on whether the bill shall be reported out or not, I would not want to commit myself until I have heard the gentleman from Arkansas. I will say this, so that Members may understand, the bill appropriates money out of the Federal Treasury to loan it to foreign governments with which to buy our agricultural products.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Has any bill been introduced at this session of Congress which the gentleman from Kansas is in favor of?

Mr. TINCER. Oh, yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Has the gentleman introduced any bill to relieve agriculture that he is in favor of?

Mr. TINCER. Oh, yes. I have not introduced one of these political bills, I will say; I have not introduced a bill that is going to cure everything. I have not got that kind of a bill.

Mr. OLDFIELD. What is your bill?

Mr. TINCER. Perhaps the gentleman's remedy is sound; perhaps he will be able to convince the Congress and the country that the way to stabilize the price of agricultural products is to take the money out of the Federal Treasury of this country and loan it to the people of Europe with which to buy our products.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I want to study the bill which the gentleman is for. I hope the gentleman will give me the number of the bill.

Mr. TINCER. Very well. When the gentleman comes over to appear before the committee on this bill of his I will call his attention to all of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does the gentleman refuse to tell me what bill he is supporting?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, I do not know the number of the bill. I have not a bill before this committee, but we are going to report out some bill.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Introduced by Mr. TINCHER.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes. But do not misunderstand me; it is not a cure-all, like the gentleman's bill. I want to hear the gentleman fully on his bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. Word has been passed out over the United States very currently that the gentleman from Kansas is the spokesman for the White House for the purpose of defeating this proposed agricultural legislation.

Mr. TINCHER. Did the gentleman pass that word out?

Mr. ROMJUE. No.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman know who did?

Mr. ROMJUE. The Lord only knows who did, but everybody has heard it.

Mr. TINCHER. I did not know about it, as I had not heard it; but I will say this, although I would not want to quote the President. I am in rather funny shape in respect to it. I can say to the gentleman that President Coolidge has never said one word to me this session of Congress about any of this mess of stuff, and I have not had the pleasure of having a talk with him since I came back from Kansas, since we started these hearings. However, it would not take much of a talker to put out all of the words which you get at the White House—he does not talk very much. [Laughter and applause.] Wait until I get through with these bills. Perhaps the gentleman has one. What one is he supporting?

Mr. ROMJUE. I am supporting the legislation of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. TINCHER. That we will report out?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; I will not say in advance until after you get your bill prepared and I have an opportunity of reading it; but I want to say to the gentleman that I was present at one of the hearings, and the gentleman a moment ago said that a bill was submitted and that they were asked to take that bill or, in effect, take the consequences of a refusal of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TINCHER. I will ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] if he will not give me a little time. Some of these boys want more time, it seems.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. ROMJUE. I was present at one of the hearings in connection with these remarks that the gentleman made a moment ago in regard to the Hirth bill. I was present when he told—

Mr. TINCHER. That is all right; I have already told about that.

Mr. ROMJUE. They were perfectly willing to leave the details to the committee, and he called on you to give that assistance to him.

Mr. TINCHER. I did not hear all that the gentleman said, but I did not misquote Mr. Hirth. The next bill that I want to call to the attention of the House is Mr. Meredith's bill. No one has introduced that yet, but in it Mr. Meredith fixes the prices, and I call the attention of the committee to the prices that he has fixed: Forty cents a pound for wool, \$1.25 a bushel for wheat, 40 cents a pound for butter, 65 cents a bushel for corn, 25 cents a pound for cotton, and 10 cents a pound for sugar. There is not one of the products that he wants to fix the price on that is not now higher than he fixed, except cotton and sugar. If he runs for President next year, he will not get very many delegates from any of the States except those maybe that grow cotton and sugar.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is Mr. Meredith?

Mr. TINCHER. He is an ex-Secretary of Agriculture from Iowa.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. And these prices are to be applied at what point—central marketing points, like Chicago?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes. There are several other bills. There is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], but we have not gotten into that bill fully. I am not saying but there is considerable merit in it. It is not offered, however, as emergency legislation, and that is one reason why we have not gone into it. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Strong] has a bill outlining his position, in which he claims that all we can do for agriculture is to create a board, such as a good many Members are beginning to think there is something in. Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, I think, said

yesterday on the floor that if we could not do anything more, we might do at least that much.

Mr. ASWELL has a bill which is the Yoakum plan. There may be some merits in the legislation, but it is not offered as emergency legislation you are talking about so much. LITTLE, of Kansas, has introduced several bills—H. R. 9874, to create a board of nine, at \$10,000 a year apiece, with authority to fix farm prices, authorized to fix prices so each farmer will receive 5½ per cent over the cost of production on all products, regardless of where produced. Then he has another bill, creating a commission at \$9,000 or \$10,000 apiece, with authority to set prices in favor of the producers.

Mr. MADDEN. Does he intend to raise the rate of earnings?

Mr. TINCHER. I do not know. I will say to the gentleman that while his bill has been extensively circulated in Kansas, he has not asked for a hearing before the committee. I saw one of the papers in the district where he said he had no doubt Congress would pass all three of his bills. I am hoping that he will come before the committee in favor of the bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I will.

Mr. ARNOLD. The gentleman has devoted a good deal of time to criticizing other bills—

Mr. TINCHER. No; I have not.

Mr. ARNOLD. I wish he would talk for about two minutes and tell us what he would do for the relief of agriculture?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes. I have not criticized anybody's bill. I said from the beginning it was a hard problem to work out, and I am calling the attention of the House to it.

Mr. ARNOLD. After the gentleman leaves this bill will he come and offer some suggestions?

Mr. TINCHER. I do not think it would be good taste to try and write the whole bill, because I am sitting as a member of the committee myself and the committee is competent to help, and the committee is sitting and works. If the gentleman has any suggestions to recommend to the committee the committee will welcome such suggestions.

Mr. ARNOLD. Pardon me, but the gentleman shows great learning along this line, and I thought perhaps the gentleman might have some sort of constructive suggestions to offer instead of criticism on somebody's bill.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman think I have been criticizing bills?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is the impression I got.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman does not think the criticism was constructive?

Mr. ARNOLD. Entirely destructive.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman comes from a corn district in Illinois, and of course he has got a bunch that does not want any equalization fee on corn, but on everything else. The gentleman is just following human nature. I am not criticizing the gentleman at all, but I am criticizing the man who would organize and threaten Congress that if they do not pass that kind of a law and put the burden on some other branch of agriculture—

Mr. ARNOLD. Tell us what to do here, or what can be done. Give us your idea.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman probably held himself out in his district as a fellow who knew what to do when he came here. [Laughter.] Why should I tell you what to do? You probably admit you know what ought to be done. Come before the committee and tell us.

Mr. ARNOLD. I am not on the committee, and the gentleman has been on the Agricultural Committee for eight years.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARNOLD. I know that the gentleman is interested in this matter, and I believe if he has any suggestion for relief he ought to give it to the House. That is what we want—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentlemen that under the rules of the House a Member on the floor must be addressed in the third person.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman from Illinois is not satisfied with my speech, is that it?

Mr. ARNOLD. I am saying to the gentleman from Kansas I am seeking light; I want information from the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. It took this committee, when it was forming a bill, called the committee print, several weeks to formulate it. I think the cooperative market bill passed this session and will be very helpful if finally enacted into law. The only other remedy then that will work will be to put the equalization fee on products and care for the export balance. But here is the trouble. We tried to pass that kind of a law through the House. We did not have votes enough then. These political people who are for this kind of legislation duck and dodge



and try to keep from their products this equalization fee and pass it on to others. I supported the McNary-Haugen bill. I said to men—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not want to ask the gentleman any political question.

Mr. TINCHER. All right.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But I do have some confidence in the gentleman's knowledge about the agricultural situation. I supported the McNary-Haugen bill, but I never have been very proud of it. I want to know how the gentleman feels now about the principles embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill. Is he still for that character of legislation?

Mr. TINCHER. I will answer the gentleman by saying that if I were going to support anything with an equalization feature in it I would try to have the nerve to put it over all.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I am asking the gentleman about his opinion, as to what he thinks now of the advisability of enacting legislation along the line of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. TINCHER. Well, I made a speech in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill, and I have read it over several times lately, and the only paragraph in that speech that I am proud of is where I said I was in favor of the legislation only as emergency legislation, but that I would not believe in my own mind that it was economically sound. [Laughter.]

There is another bill, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS], which is a comprehensive measure known as the Illinois proposition, by which he proposes to collect debentures. It is really an export bounty issued in the way of scrip.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I sent out to the document room, and I am advised that this is the only bill which the gentleman from Kansas has introduced on the subject of the farm situation at this session, a bill to prevent discriminations against farmers' cooperative associations. Does the gentleman think that will do the work?

Mr. TINCHER. Well, while the gentleman was out of the Chamber I explained about that. I do not claim that that will perform miracles.

I have been the author of about six laws since I have been in Congress—laws which are now on the statute books—and I assert that you have not had the nerve to attempt to repeal one of them, because they help. But, gentlemen, I have always contended that there is no magic or witchcraft in law that will lift agriculture artificially out of its present situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TINCHER. May I have a little more time?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. TINCHER. I have here the bill H. R. 6563, which is Mr. Dickinson's bill, which is available, in which there is no dodging or squirming or twisting. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] has come squarely about on the equalization fee. We tried last session to pass it, and failed to get a sufficient number of votes to pass it. This year those people came down here and mutilated the Dickinson bill, and say they do not want an equalization fee, not on corn or wheat, but on other products and on all process meats. They are not united. They differ from each other in their opinion.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK] has a bill on the storage proposition. I understand it is not offered as a cure-all for all the evils that afflict agriculture. It is not what might be termed an emergency bill.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SINCLAIR] has several bills pending before the committee, all involving a heavy charge against the Treasury. I will not say that; but he has one bill embodying the principal features of the old Norris-Sinclair principle, entailing an equalization charge upon the Treasury.

Gentlemen, in making this speech here to-day I was not prompted by anyone, except that I heard the speech of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] yesterday—and he had a perfect right to make it—and Congress has the right to know what the committee has been doing. I want to call attention to the fact that the committee is not to blame for one day's delay. We have been there ready to hear these men. For several years I have been engaged in that work. This year

those people have behaved more inconsistently than I ever knew them to behave before. But if there is anything that can be worked out that will help the farmer, let us try to work it out as Members of Congress ready and willing to help, and not attempt to see how much political stiletto work can be got out of saying to one man, "You were for the bill before," and accusing somebody of being against the bill now. When I came here eight years ago I had the idea that the grain exchanges and the packers did not treat agriculture fairly under the law. Some laws have been passed in my name putting them under governmental supervision. I do not want to destroy them. I am advocating a bill, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] suggests, to force the exchanges to cooperate with the farmers on the exchanges. [Applause.]

I want the Members of the House to be fair with the Committee on Agriculture. It is easy to say to some other man, "Tell us how to do it," but if you have a remedy by which we can pay any fixed per cent of profit on agricultural products above the cost of production, when in one locality the cost is twice as much as it is in another, when in one locality we fail and do not fail in another, I ask that you come before the Committee on Agriculture and inform us. We will hear you. We may quarrel a little now and then among ourselves, but when we put out a bill we get together and try to pass it. I give you my idea of what we are wrestling over. A good many of the boys have introduced bills that they may have forgotten about. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I know of one Member of Congress who appeared before your committee, and I have heard it suggested many times that my information was not wanted in that committee. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman may have been talking with the gentleman from Missouri. It has always been my understanding that the committee has always prized the gentleman's opinion highly, and I may say to the gentleman that we have had no notion about closing these hearings without extending to him an invitation to appear there and give us his advice and suggestions. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. Under leave to extend, the committee print No. 1, hereinbefore referred to, follows:

A bill to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surpluses of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in order to promote the general welfare of the United States, to promote the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities; to enable producers of agricultural commodities to stabilize their markets against undue and excessive fluctuations and minimize speculation and waste in marketing; to encourage the organization of producers of agricultural commodities into cooperative associations; and to protect domestic markets against world prices by providing for the control and disposition of the surpluses of agricultural commodities.

#### FEDERAL FARM ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Federal farm advisory council (hereinafter referred to as the "council") to consist of five members from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts. The members of the council from each district shall be elected by the bona fide farm organizations and cooperative associations in such district at a convention of such organizations and associations, to be held at the office of the Federal land bank in such district or at such other place in the city in which such Federal land bank is located as the convention may adjourn to.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually, with the advice and assistance of the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the master of the National Grange, and the president of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, (1) fix the date on which such conventions shall be held, (2) designate the farm organizations and cooperative associations in each district eligible to participate in such conventions, and (3) designate the number of representatives and the number of votes to which each such organization or association shall be entitled. The Secretary of Agriculture shall mail, at least 15 days prior to the date on which a convention is to be held, to each organization and association eligible to participate in such convention, notice of the date and place of such convention. The conventions first held after the date of enactment of this act shall be held within 45 days after such date. The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe uniform regulations for the procedure at such conventions and for the proper certification of election of the members of the council.

(c) The term of office of each member first elected shall expire one year from the date of his election, and the term of office of all successors shall expire one year from the date of the expiration of the preceding term. Any member in office at the expiration of the term for which he was elected may continue in office until his successor takes office.

(d) The members of the council shall serve without salary but may be paid by the Federal farm board, (established in section 4 and hereinafter referred to as the "board") a per diem compensation not exceeding \$25 for attending meetings of the council. Each member shall be paid by the board his necessary traveling expenses to and from the meetings of the council and his actual expenses while engaged upon the business of the council.

#### DUTIES OF COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) The council shall—

(1) Meet and organize as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act and select a chairman, secretary, and such other officers as it deems necessary.

(2) Nominate to the President three individuals from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts eligible for appointment to the board.

(3) Meet thereafter at least twice in each year at a time and place designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; or upon a petition duly signed by a majority of the individuals elected to the council at a time and place designated therein.

(4) Nominate individuals to fill vacancies occurring in the board.

(5) Submit to the board such recommendations, and cooperate with the board in such manner as the council deems most effective to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The individuals to be nominated for appointment to the board from any district shall be selected by the members of the council from such district.

#### FEDERAL FARM BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Agriculture a board to be known as the Federal farm board and to be composed of 12 members, one from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the individuals nominated as provided in section 3.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be an ex officio member of the board.

#### APPOINTMENT AND QUALIFICATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. (a) The terms of office of the appointed members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, four at the end of the second year, four at the end of the fourth year, and four at the end of the sixth year, after the date of the enactment of this act. A successor to an appointed member shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the individuals nominated, as provided in subdivision (d) of this section, for a term expiring six years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(b) Any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(c) Any member in office at the expiration of the term for which he was appointed may continue in office until his successor takes office.

(d) Whenever a vacancy occurs in the board or whenever, in the opinion of the chairman of the board, a vacancy will soon occur, he shall notify the council thereof and request that the council nominate three individuals qualified to fill such vacancy. Upon receipt of such nominations he shall submit their names to the President as the nominees for such vacancy.

(e) Vacancies in the board shall not impair the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the board, and a majority of the appointed members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the board.

(f) Each of the appointed members shall be a citizen of the United States, shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the board, and shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, together with necessary traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, while away from the principal office of the board on business required by this act.

#### GENERAL POWERS OF BOARD

SEC. 6. The board—

(a) Shall annually designate an appointed member to act as chairman of the board.

(b) Shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia.

(c) Shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) Shall make an annual report to the Congress.

(e) May make such regulations as are necessary to execute the functions vested in it by this act.

(f) May (1) appoint and fix the salaries of such experts and, in accordance with the classification act of 1923 and subject to the pro-

visions of the civil service laws, a secretary and such other officers and employees, and (2) make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding), as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the board. All expenditures of the board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman.

#### SPECIAL POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 7. (a) The board shall meet at the call of the chairman at least weekly, and at such other times as the Secretary of Agriculture or the chairman deems advisable.

(b) The board is authorized—

(1) To obtain, from any available sources, information in respect of crop prospects, supply, demand, current receipts, exports, imports, markets, transportation costs and facilities, and prices of agricultural commodities, and economic, legal, and financial information in respect of the organization, progress, and business methods of cooperative associations in the United States and foreign countries.

(2) To disseminate any such information, or analyses or summaries thereof, from time to time, among cooperative associations and farm organizations in the United States.

(3) To advise cooperative associations, farm organizations, and producers in the adjustment of production in order to secure the maximum benefits under this act.

#### CONTROL AND DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS

SEC. 8. (a) The board shall keep advised by investigations, from time to time, made upon its own initiative or upon petition of any cooperative association or farm organization, of the domestic and world prices and the existence or the probability of the existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity or any food product thereof.

(b) The board shall furnish, upon request, to any cooperative association or farm organization, or to any producer of any agricultural commodity, or to any person owning or controlling any of such commodity, its recommendations upon the disposition of such commodity, or any surplus thereof, and upon the available methods of financing. Whenever the board is of opinion that the provisions of this act applicable to a basic agricultural commodity (as defined in subdivision (c) of this section) should be made applicable to any other agricultural commodity, it shall submit its report thereon to Congress.

(c) Whenever the board finds (1) that there is or may be during the ensuing year a surplus above domestic requirements of cotton, wheat, cattle, or swine (hereinafter referred to as "basic agricultural commodity"), or any food product of wheat, cattle, or swine; and (2) that a substantial number of the cooperative associations or other organizations representing the producers of such basic agricultural commodity are in favor thereof, the board shall determine upon and declare an operation period and prepare for its operations in respect of such basic agricultural commodity.

(d) During such operation period the board shall assist in removing or withholding from the domestic market the surplus above domestic requirements of such basic agricultural commodity or food product by entering into agreements with cooperative associations engaged in handling such basic agricultural commodity, or with a corporation or association created by one or more of such cooperative associations, or with persons engaged in processing such basic agricultural commodity, for the payment, out of the equalization fund hereinafter established, of losses, and the payment into the equalization fund of profits, arising out of the purchase, storage, sale, or other disposition, and/or contracts for the purchase, storage, sale, or other disposition (after such agreement has been entered into and in accordance with the terms and conditions thereof) of such basic agricultural commodity or food product, except that—

(1) If the board is of the opinion that there is no such cooperative association capable of carrying out any such agreement, the board, prior to the expiration of two years from the enactment of this act, shall enter into such agreements with other agencies; and

(2) Such agreement shall provide, among other things, that no payment of losses shall be made unless the purchase or contract for the purchase is made at a price which in the opinion of the board is not in excess of a fair and reasonable price, and that no sale or contract for sale shall be made in respect of which a loss would be sustained unless such sale or contract is authorized by the board.

(e) If the board is of the opinion that there are two or more cooperative associations capable of carrying out any such agreements the board, in entering into such agreements, shall not discriminate unreasonably against any such association and in favor of any other such association.

#### PURPOSES OF EQUALIZATION FEE

SEC. 9. In order that the producers of each basic agricultural commodity may pay ratably their equitable share of the losses and expenses to be paid by the board in respect of such operation period; in order to prevent any unjust discrimination against, any direct burden or undue restraint upon, and any suppression of, commerce in basic agricultural commodities with foreign nations in favor of interstate



or intrastate commerce; and in order to encourage and stimulate the normal and usual current of foreign and interstate commerce in basic agricultural commodities, an equalization fee shall be apportioned and paid, is hereinafter provided, during the operation period in respect of such basic agricultural commodity.

#### DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF FEE

SEC. 10. Prior to the operation period in respect of any basic agricultural commodity the board shall estimate the probable losses and expenses to be paid in respect of such operation period. Having due regard to such estimates, the board shall determine and publish the amount for each unit of weight, measure, or value designated by it to be collected upon the processing of such basic agricultural commodity during such operation period. Such amount is hereinafter referred to as the "equalization fee."

#### PAYMENT AND COLLECTION OF FEE

SEC. 11. (a) During the operation period in respect of any basic agricultural commodity, the equalization fee shall be paid, under such regulations as the board may prescribe, upon the processing (as hereinafter defined) of such basic agricultural commodity.

(b) The board may by regulation require any person engaged in processing such basic agricultural commodity, during such operation period, to file returns under oath and to report, in respect of his purchases and processing of such basic agricultural commodity, the amount of the equalization fees payable thereon, and any other facts which may be necessary for the payment or collection of the equalization fees.

(c) Every person who, in violation of the regulations prescribed by the board, fails to account for any equalization fee shall be liable for such fee and to a penalty equal to one-half the amount of such fee. Such fee and penalty may be recovered together in a civil suit brought by the board in the name of the United States.

#### EQUALIZATION FUND

SEC. 12. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the board, there shall be established an equalization fund for each operation period and for each basic agricultural commodity, into which the equalization fees and the profits for such operation period shall be deposited.

(b) The board, in anticipation of the collection of the equalization fees for any operation period, and in order to provide for the prompt payment of the losses agreed to be paid, of the salaries and expenses of experts, and of the refunds on exportation (as provided in section 16), in respect of such operation period, may advance to the equalization fund of any basic agricultural commodity, out of the revolving fund hereinafter established, such amounts as may be necessary.

(c) From such equalization fund, the losses agreed to be paid in respect of such operation period by the board shall be disbursed, the salaries and expenses of such experts as the board determine should be payable therefrom shall be disbursed, and any amounts advanced from the revolving fund (hereinafter established) and remaining unpaid (together with interest on such amounts at the rate of 4 per cent per annum) in respect of such basic agricultural commodity, shall be repaid. Any balance remaining in such fund shall be transferred to the equalization fund of such basic agricultural commodity for the next operation period.

#### AUDITS OF BOOKS AND ACCOUNTS OF BOARD

SEC. 13. The books and accounts of the board showing the payments of the losses and profits under agreements entered into under section 7, salaries and expenses of experts, and refunds on exportation shall be audited at least once every year at such times and by such auditors as the board may direct. The report of such auditors shall be included in the annual report to the Congress.

#### COOPERATION WITH EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 14. (a) It shall be the duty of any governmental establishment in the executive branch of the Government, upon request by the board, or upon Executive order, to cooperate with and render assistance to the board in carrying out any of the provisions of this act and the regulations of the board. The board may, in cooperation with any such governmental establishment, avail itself of the services and facilities of such governmental establishment in order to avoid preventable expense or duplication of effort.

(b) The President may by Executive order direct any such governmental establishment to furnish the board with such information and data pertaining to the functions of the board as may be contained in the records of such governmental establishment. The order of the President may provide such limitations as to the use of the information and data as he deems desirable.

(c) The board may cooperate with any State or Territory, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or with any person.

#### DEFINITIONS AND SHORT TITLE

SEC. 15. (a) As used in this act—

(1) In the case of wheat, the term "processing" means the milling for market of wheat, or the first processing in any manner for market of wheat not so milled.

(2) In the case of cotton, the term "processing" means the milling for market of cotton, or the first processing in any manner (other than ginning) of cotton not so milled.

(3) In the case of cattle and swine, the term "processing" means slaughter for market.

(4) The term "person" means individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(5) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means continental United States.

(6) The term "cooperative association" means an association of persons engaged in the production of agricultural products, as farmers, planters, ranchers, dairymen, or nut or fruit growers, organized to carry out any purpose specified in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922, whether or not such association is qualified under such act.

(b) This act may be cited as the "Federal farm board act of 1926."

#### REVOLVING FUND AND APPROPRIATION

SEC. 17. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$250,000,000, which shall be administered by the board and used as a revolving fund, in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(b) For expenses in the administration of the functions vested in the board by this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$300,000, to be available to the board for such expenses (including salaries and expenses of the members and the per diem compensation and expenses of members of the council) incurred prior to July 1, 1927.

#### SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person, commodity, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons, commodities, and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

#### REFUND ON EXPORTATION

SEC. 16. (a) Upon the exportation from the United States of any product of a basic agricultural commodity in respect of which an equalization fee has been paid, the board shall allow and pay, out of the proper equalization fund, a refund in an amount equal to the amount of such equalization fee properly allocable to such product.

(b) The board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for determining the amount of such refund, the identity and quantity of such basic agricultural commodity, and the payment of such refund to the exporter or to the person to whom the exporter shall in writing order such refund to be paid.

#### RELIEF OF CORN EMERGENCY

SEC. 19. (a) The board is authorized and directed to enter into agreements, under the conditions applicable in the case of a basic agricultural commodity, for the payment of losses arising out of the purchase (as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act), drying, storage, sale, or other disposition, of corn, or products thereof, except that—

(1) Such losses shall be paid out of, and any profits shall be paid into, the revolving fund;

(2) No operation period shall be declared, and no equalization fee shall be paid or collected; and

(3) Such agreement shall provide, among other things, that corn purchased prior to November 1, 1926, shall not be sold in the United States prior to January 1, 1927.

(b) So much of the revolving fund as may be necessary, but not exceeding the sum of \$100,000,000, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of subdivision (a).

(c) On and after the tenth day after the date of the enactment of this act and until the expiration of one year from such date it shall be unlawful to import into the United States any article included in paragraph 724 of the tariff act of 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, in the very limited time allotted to me I request that I may be permitted to proceed to the end of my speech without interruption.

I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to an industrial situation which exists in my district in New Jersey at the present time, reports of which no doubt many of you have read in the daily press.

For the past eight weeks there has been a strike in the textile mills of Passaic, my home city, and surrounding communities, and representatives of the strikers and of the mill owners have recently been in Washington for the purpose of laying their claims before governmental agencies.

Serious charges are being made by both sides, and the good name of Passaic, as well as that of neighboring cities, is being subjected to unenviable notoriety and unjust criticism. The

press of New Jersey has pointed out that sensational newspapers have been most unfair in their treatment of this whole situation. The governor, A. Harry Moore, who has been in close touch with the situation and who agreed to act as arbitrator, is reported as having made the following comment:

The picture newspapers don't report the news; they make it up. In Passaic they took photos of strikers in gas masks and helmets which the photographers themselves gave them to wear for the purpose. There has not been one striker injured yet, although these papers have given the impression of riot after riot. I was approached by one of the newspapermen at my home who asked me when I was going to call out the troops. I asked him if any person had been killed, and he said he did not know of any. I asked him if any had been struck, and he said he had been struck by the police. I then asked him if he expected me to call out the troops because the police had struck him. The reporter then asked me if I would submit to being photographed with him presenting his complaint. I refused, of course.

On Wednesday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] introduced in the House a resolution, which I will read, and it is because of this resolution I have asked for this opportunity to address the House:

Whereas there is a strike of textile workers now taking place in certain mills located at Passaic, N. J., for the perfectly legal purpose of obtaining living wages and decent working conditions, where at present the conditions that prevail are below the level necessary for the maintenance of life and health; and

Whereas the striking workers of the said mills are denied the right of peaceful assemblage for the purpose of organizing their forces to obtain decent working conditions, and brutal assaults have been made upon these workers by police officers and other city officials in Passaic, some of whom have gone to the extent of employing tear gases in an effort to prevent the people from exercising their constitutional rights, all of which is clearly in contravention of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the textile industry of New Jersey, in which the strike is taking place, is primarily engaged in the production of goods to be shipped in interstate commerce, and the conditions under which those goods are made are therefore cognizable under Federal powers of our Government: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives of the United States be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of the conditions created by the strike situation at Passaic, N. J., and also to ascertain and to report to the House of Representatives whether the officials of that city have violated the Constitution of the United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin informed my secretary that he introduced the resolution under protest. He may have assumed that I was not in sympathy with an investigation, but I will say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that I am not opposed to any investigation which will be fair and impartial, if it is deemed to be within the province of this body to direct such an investigation. But at this time I can not too strongly resent the charges made in the preamble which discredit Passaic, my home city, where I have lived for 35 years and which I have seen grow from a small village of 13,000 to a city of 80,000, which I served for eight years as mayor.

I have been following this strike situation as closely as possible, and I could not credit the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin reflecting on the city government and wired the text of the preamble to the secretary of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce, the mayor, and the director of public safety and have received the following telegrams in reply:

PASSAIC, N. J., March 18, 1926.

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Reply your wire regarding charge striking workers denied right peaceful assemblage. This is incorrect. Strikers meet daily for organization purposes at Russian National Home, Passaic, Belmont Park, Pollack's Castle, Park Garfield, also Lodi Hall, without molestation. Newbauer Hall, Passaic, was closed to strikers by action of owners. Police authorities have publicly guaranteed strikers use of halls for peaceful assemblage; have allowed strikers to picket, have issued parade permits, and have allowed tag day. Regarding charge of brutal assaults by police, treatment strikers highly exaggerated by sensational newspapers. During period strike January 25 to March 16 were 19 strike arrests in Passaic. Principally disorderly conduct; light jail sentences; majority now out on bail. Only 2 minor hospital cases. Tear gas tested once unsuccessfully in attempt disperse crowd defying police orders. Chamber of commerce on record demanding maintenance law and order and standing behind commissioner public safety in such

efforts. Very difficult control excited crowds, several thousands, with small police force, and general belief here police have almost uniformly handled situation tactfully and without abridgment civil rights.

WINFIELD CLEARWATER,  
Secretary Passaic Chamber of Commerce.

PASSAIC, N. J., March 18, 1926.

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,  
Congressman, House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The police as well as officials of Passaic have used every endeavor to safeguard and permit the lawful exercise of the constitutional rights and personal privileges of everybody, including strikers. The workers on strike have not been denied the exercise of rights, as stated by Congressman BERGER, but, on the contrary, given every protection and insurance. The strike agitators, pursuing a political theory contrary to that of the Government of United States, are seeking notoriety for the purpose of furthering their beliefs, and are causing highly colored and exaggerated stories to be given out with a view to enlisting aid for their cause. The strike is only a means to an end with them. There has been no great trouble in Passaic. The rights of no person have been infringed. Only a small number of arrests have been made by the police, and the whole strike matter could be easily settled if the agitators would leave Passaic and go back to where they came from. Mr. BERGER has been misinformed.

JOHN H. MCGUIRE, Mayor.

PASSAIC, N. J., March 18, 1926.

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,  
Congressman, House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

The statement that the strikers are denied the right of peaceful assemblage is an absolute lie. Every hall or meeting place in our city is open to them with one exception, Newbauer's Hall, which was closed by the owner himself. Every consideration was and is being given to the strikers. Permits for parades through the city, tag days, and picketing has and is now going on at all the mills. So far as brutal assaults upon the workers are concerned, there is no truth in this statement. The police officers have taken all kinds of abuse from the strikers; and when one considers that there are about 10,000 out on strike and but 19 arrests made to date, I feel the situation has been taken care of in a wonderful manner. The police are only concerned in preserving law and order. The local papers, chamber of commerce, Elks, war veterans, and many other organizations, as well as many of our leading citizens, have endorsed the fair stand of the police department in dealing with the situation.

ABRAM PREISKEI,  
Director of Public Safety.

The resolution introduced by the gentlemen from Wisconsin has also come to the attention of some of the mill owners, and they also desire an investigation. Let me read a telegram received from the Botany Worsted Mills, in which the strike started:

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 18, 1926.

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

As the Representative of the seventh district of New Jersey, we ask you to support the resolution directing the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate strike conditions in the Passaic mills. In this manner it can be brought home to the country that this strike is communistic in instigation and purposely designed to propagandize the communist attack on the industry and Government of this country. In this effort no falsehood has been left unsaid, no trick of revolution not attempted. Communists and I. W. W. agitators from the entire country have flocked to Passaic to advance the scheme to make this strike what the official communist organ of the country has openly called "A schooling in revolution." The interests of your district, of the city of Passaic, the State of New Jersey, its labor and its industries, require that the facts and truth be ascertained. Wages in Passaic are as high or higher than elsewhere in the industry, and the average wage in our own plant, based on 41 hours' work as against a full week of 48 hours for 1925 was \$22.85 per week; for 1924, based on 42 hours' work, was \$23.96.

Sanitary conditions in our own mills have been approved and commended by the labor department of the State. Fingerprinting or any other form of espionage has never been attempted. The strike broke out of a clear sky, without previous complaint from our employees as to wages, conditions of labor, or otherwise. As Representative of the city of Passaic, you know the facts as to the integrity of the public officials of the city and the manner in which they have dealt with difficulties occasioned by deliberately fomented attacks upon law and order in the city. The spread of the strike has been accomplished by illegal methods used in mass picketing and intimidation and is admittedly an effort on the part of the communistic leadership of this



strike to involve the whole textile industry of the country. Such a strike can result in no good to labor or the employees involved. It can serve only to advance the selfish objects of a small group which in no way represents the real interests of labor in this country, and which is seeking to use the strike to promote the organization of branches of the Communist Party in New Jersey and to exploit political theories out of keeping with the law of the land. The sooner these facts are known the sooner will industrial peace be restored in your district and thousands of employees have a chance to return to work, as they want to do, and which they are now barred from doing by acts or threats of violence. Since the outbreak of the strike the Department of Labor has had its representatives on the ground, and what they know and all the facts should be made public by such an investigation as is proposed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. We therefore urge you to do your utmost to accomplish the adoption of the resolution, despite the erroneous allegations in its preamble, which we assume would be covered by the investigation.

BOTANY WORSTED MILLS.

Now, let me say in fairness to the strikers, that excepting the leadership, which is almost entirely from outside of the city, and a noisy minority, which is in sympathy with this leadership, the rank and file of the strikers are law-abiding citizens, many of whom are my personal friends. If this leadership is as has been stated in these telegrams, then we are confronted with a serious condition, which also demands attention, and if a fair and impartial investigation going into all sides of this question can be had, then by all means let us have such an investigation. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE].

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, just 100 years have passed since the death of the great American statesman, Thomas Jefferson, and it is fitting that we of the present generation should pause long enough at the end of the century to show some measure of respect to his memory and to express a grateful appreciation for the invaluable service he has rendered to the American Republic of the United States, and to contemplate the effect of his life and work upon the affairs of the entire world.

It is therefore my hope to lay before you facts and circumstances surrounding the times in which he lived and to review some achievements and accomplishments of Mr. Jefferson in order to rekindle a desire for the perpetuity of the principles of our American Government.

Let us, therefore, get accurately a mental picture of this patriot and statesman—April 13, 1743, N. S., saw his entry into the world, the son of Peter Jefferson, of Welsh descent, and of Jane Randolph Jefferson, of good Scotch family, she being a daughter of Isham Randolph, a wealthy tobacco planter of Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson was born in Albemarle County, Va.; grew up tall, rather angular, and rawboned, having reddish hair and florid complexion. He was a great reader and an inveterate student and very tenacious in his purposes. He was not an orator, not even a forceful public speaker. In fact, he seldom participated in active public debate. Although he drafted the Declaration of Independence, he left it for others very largely to debate. He was a most profound student, and in private conversation with public men of his time was more liable than any other man of his or any time since that day to convince his listener to the belief in the soundness of his views.

Mr. Jefferson grew up under the influence of country life and in contact with plainly living, virtuous people. The civilization of Virginia during his time, and particularly during his youth, was uniformly and universally rural. When Jefferson at the age of 17 entered Williamsburg College he had never in his life seen a collection of houses numbering as many as a dozen. There were no large towns, no manufacturing industries, no intercountry or intercolonial commerce. Farming was the one occupation of the people and tobacco the one product of the farm. The farms, sometimes consisting of thousands of acres, were tilled by slaves very largely, and slaves and tobacco formed the basis of wealth. Jefferson was, or grew up to be, a farmer and lawyer, owned slaves, and impoverished his land by the cultivation of tobacco. He esteemed farmers as God's chosen people, and he never ceased to praise agriculture as the one moral and ennobling vocation. On one occasion he said to Mr. Madison:

I think our Government will remain virtuous for many centuries as long as they are chiefly agricultural; and this will be as long as there shall be vacant lands in any part of America. When they get piled up on one another in large cities, as in Europe, they will become corrupt as in Europe.

Throughout his life his interest in agriculture and the farm never lessened. He loved to travel through the fields and the

woods, and often while he was President he would repair to the old farm home for consolation, quietude, and comfort from the cares and worries of public life. He enjoyed living close to nature; it proved to be his dependable friend. He enjoyed its companionship, and it helped to make him great.

He was particularly a thorough student of the law and of political science, and begun his public life as a vestryman of the parish church and justice of the county court, offices which his father held before him, and in 1769 he was elected a member of the House of Burgesses, an office which his father had also held. After his admission to the bar as an attorney he practiced law and managed his farm until 1774. Then public offices to which he was elected from time to time consumed most all his time, although he always retained an interest in his farming enterprises.

With a strong mastering desire for study, with an atmosphere of plain virtuous country life about him, he came in contact and companionship with Wythe, a great lawyer; Doctor Small, a great teacher; and Governor Fauquier, a vivacious political expert. At all times Jefferson kept his feet on the ground and his brain and pen at work. With these surrounding circumstances may we now look at his political views and his public service?

He was a man of broad views, powerful and original intellect, and by his nature in sympathy with the most advanced political doctrines of his age. He created the code of Democracy and thereby rendered possible also the creation of a party which should adopt that code.

Mr. Jefferson regarded no form of government so safe and so good for his own people as a republic. Whether he would have advocated the same kind of government for England or for the Spanish people or for some other nation might give room for speculation, but it is certain he advocated and thought a republic such as he helped to establish in America the best for our people, and so it is.

On one occasion he said:

I know indeed that some honest men fear that a republic can not be strong, that this Government is not strong enough, but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a Government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others—or have we found angels in the form of Kings to govern him? Let history answer.

Near the beginning of that document by which Mr. Jefferson is best known, are the following assertions:

That men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.

That this statement is true is removed from the possibility of doubt; this statement, in a more amplified form, was made by Mr. Jefferson in his first inaugural address, a quarter of a century after the Declaration of Independence, when, after enumerating some of the advantages enjoyed by American citizens in the way of our boundless resources and a due sense of our equal rights, he asks:

What more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing, fellow citizens, a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

The Declaration of Independence was criticized and roughly handled when it came up for adoption, and the discussion became so acrimonious as to be embarrassing to Mr. Jefferson, yet he had faith and conviction of its propriety and soundness. The debate continued for three days, with the prospect at times of it being interminable and fruitless. Mr. Jefferson became gloomy and anxious. He wanted America to be free and her independence to be established. At last, in the afternoon of the 4th of July, a comical circumstance brought the discussion to an end, according to a story told by Mr. Jefferson himself.

Near the hall in which the legislative body sat was a livery stable, from which on that afternoon a swarm of vicious flies issued and, entering through the open windows, attacked the thinly covered legs of the Members. Resistance was made with

handkerchief and fan, but to little effect. The biting became unendurable, and the dignified body, goaded to distraction, hurried on to a swift and ridiculous conclusion of the momentous question. To escape the flies, a vote was taken; the declaration was adopted, four Members voting against it; New York withholding its vote. It was signed at once by John Hancock, president, and Charles Thompson, secretary. The remaining signatures were added August 2, 1776.

After the passing of 150 years it is still the opinion of many that debate should be brought to an end by flies rather than by the cloture rule. [Applause.] And I think so myself, except for the fact that we no longer have any sufficient number of horseflies. On July 5 Congress adopted a resolution directing the declaration to be sent to the several assemblies, conventions, and councils of safety and to all officers of the Continental Army.

It was soon heralded throughout the United States. It met with the most enthusiastic ratification and adoption from New Hampshire to Georgia. There were bonfires, torchlight processions, the firing of guns, and the ringing of bells. The people seemed to recognize this resolution as though it was a decree promulgated from Heaven.

The Declaration of Independence has been severely criticized both for its style and for the principles it enunciates, but its place among the great papers of history is secure and criticism of it has long since become idle and uninteresting.

Jefferson was saturated with ideas of reform when he wrote the declaration, and he aimed to make it a profession of his political faith. His faith was that of a Democrat, and the Declaration of Independence is a formal expression of the beliefs and aspirations of the democracy of his time. It is a remarkable document, because it so successfully proclaims the spirit of the age in which it was written.

On yesterday I went to the Congressional Library here in Washington, where the Declaration of Independence is deposited, and as I looked upon it I tried to visualize the new order of government of which it was the forerunner and to contemplate the manifold blessings to humanity which are ceaselessly to come, sharing its glory and beneficence with each succeeding generation. If only each generation going before is wise enough to pledge and contribute an undying fealty to the fundamentals upon which the great document with its companion paper, the Constitution, are founded.

That Mr. Jefferson was an ardent supporter of the fundamentals embodied in the Constitution of the United States is recognized beyond every reasonable doubt. He said:

I look forward to the general adoption of the new Constitution with anxiety, as necessary for us under our present circumstances.

And later on he said:

I have seen with infinite pleasure our new Constitution accepted by eleven States, not rejected by the twelfth, and that the thirteenth happens to be a State of the least importance.

Mr. Jefferson had this further to say:

I approved from the first moment of the great mass of what is in the new Constitution.

Although there was some difference of opinion among nearly all who participated in one way or another, actively interested in the construction of the Constitution, it is certain that the Constitution was nearer to his ideal upon the one side than it was to Hamilton's ideal upon the other.

The only serious objections, which Mr. Jefferson retained to the end, were the absence of a bill of rights and the presence of the reeligibility of the President. The former real defect was promptly and wisely cured. The latter has been practically controlled by wise custom which he, himself, helped to inaugurate.

These extracts, which I have just quoted from Mr. Jefferson, could be multiplied by many more of identical tenor. They abundantly show Mr. Jefferson's real sentiment concerning the Constitution and refute and nullify every unfair charge leveled at the great statesman by his political enemies.

On every question of the construction of the Constitution—said Mr. Jefferson—

let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollecting the spirit manifested in the debates, and, instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.

Mr. Jefferson gives further evidence of his political faith by this significant utterance:

I do with sincere zeal wish an inviolable preservation of our present Federal Constitution according to the true sense in which it was adopted by the States, that in which it was advocated by its friends

and not that which its enemies apprehended, who therefore became its enemies; and I am opposed to the monarchizing its features by the forms of its administration with a view to conciliate a first transition to a President and Senate for life, and from that to a hereditary tenure of these offices, and thus to worm out the elective principle. I am for preserving to the States the powers not yielded by them to the Union, and to the legislature of the Union its constitutional share in the division of the powers; and I am not for transferring all the powers of the States to the General Government and all those of that Government to the executive branch. I am for a Government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt.

In a letter to General Washington in 1792 Mr. Jefferson thus writes:

My whole correspondence while in France, and every word and letter and act on the subject since my return, prove that no man is more ardently intent to see the public debt soon and sacredly paid off than I am. This exactly marks the difference between Colonel Hamilton's views and mine, that I would wish the debt paid to-morrow; he wishes it never to be paid, but always to be a thing wherewith to corrupt and manage the legislature.

As further evidence of Jefferson's attitude on public or national debt, he gives expression to this sound doctrine in a letter to Albert Gallatin, in 1800:

I consider the fortunes of our Republic as depending in an imminent degree on the extinguishment of the public debt before we engage in any war, because that done we shall have revenue to improve our country in peace and defend it in war without recurring to new taxes or loans; but if the debt should once more be swelled to a formidable size its entire discharge will be despaired of and we shall be committed to the English career of debt, corruption, and rottenness, closing with revolution. The discharge of the debt, therefore, is vital to the destinies of our Government.

This Congress, although it has pursued a policy of economy lower than that recommended by President Coolidge, misleading information purposely given to the public notwithstanding, should yet listen to the doctrine announced by Mr. Jefferson, as follows:

To preserve—

Says he—

the faith of the Nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts, expend the public money with the same care and economy we would practice with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burden; to keep in all things within the pale of our rock of safety—these, fellow citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings. By continuing to make these our rule of action, we shall endeavor to our countrymen the true principles of their Constitution and promote a union of sentiment and of action equally auspicious to their happiness and safety.

Mr. Jefferson was a Democrat in the true and practical sense. He believed firmly in liberty and not in unrestrained license; he believed in the broadest liberty for human society, and for the individual citizen so long as it did not infringe upon the rights or work to the injury of a fellow citizen; he believed that every society has a right to fix the fundamental principles of its association and to say to all individuals that, if they contemplate pursuits beyond the limits of these principles and involving dangers which the society chooses to avoid, they must go somewhere else for their exercise; that we want no citizens and still less pseudo citizens on such terms. That we might exclude them from our territory, as we do persons infected with disease, such he believed to be the situation of our country; and so believing, he said:

We have the most abundant resources of happiness within ourselves, which we may enjoy in peace and safety, without permitting a few citizens infected with the mania of rambling and gambling to bring danger on the great mass of innocent and safe pursuits at home. A government regulating itself by what is wise and just for the many, uninfluenced by the local and selfish views of the few who direct their affairs, has not been seen, perhaps, on earth. Or if it existed for a moment at the birth of ours, it would not be easy to fix the term of its continuance. Still, I believe it does exist here in a greater degree than anywhere else.

Mr. Jefferson had faith in the people and an abiding love and affection for the average citizen. However poor the citizen might be, if he was honest he commanded Mr. Jefferson's respect, and for such a citizen he had a greater affection and respect than he did for a king. His attitude toward the common or average man and his kindly feeling for him marked with certainty the greatness of Mr. Jefferson, as such an attitude and feeling or the lack of it always indicates the caliber of any man.



Mr. Jefferson looked with more favor and with more respect at the average citizen of a country than he did at the king of any land, and he had this observation to make relative to kings:

The practice of kings marrying only in the families of kings has been that of Europe for some centuries. Now, take any race of animals, confine them in idleness and inaction, whether in a stable, a stable, or a stateroom, pamper them with high diet, gratify all their sexual appetites, immerse them in sensualities, nourish their passions, let everything bend before them, and banish whatever might lead them to think, and in a few generations they become all body and no mind; and this, too, by a law of nature, by that very law by which we are in constant practice of changing the characters and propensities of the animals we raise for our own purposes. Such is the regimen in raising kings, and in this way they have gone on for centuries. While in Europe I often amused myself with contemplating the characters of the then reigning sovereigns of Europe. Louis XVI was a fool, of my own knowledge, and in despite of the answers made for him at his trial. The King of Spain was a fool, and of Naples the same. They passed their lives in hunting, and dispatched two couriers a week 1,000 miles to let each other know what game they had killed the preceding days. The King of Sardinia was a fool. All these were Bourbons. The Queen of Portugal, a Braganza, was an idiot by nature, and so was the King of Denmark. Their sons, as regents, exercised the powers of governments. The King of Prussia, successor to the great Frederick, was a mere hog in body as well as in mind. Gustavus of Sweden and Joseph of Austria were really crazy, and George of England, as you know, was in a straight waistcoat.

There remained then none but old Catharine, who had been too lately picked up to have lost her common sense. In this state Bonaparte found Europe, and it was this state of its rulers which lost it with scarce a struggle. These animals had become without mind and powerless, and so will every hereditary monarch be after a few generations. Alexander, the grandson of Catharine, is as yet an exception. He is able to hold his own, but he is only of the third generation. His race is not yet worn out. And so endeth the book of kings, from all of whom the Lord deliver us.

Mr. Jefferson recognized and believed in political party organization and in the necessity for political parties as representing the principles of government in which any considerable number of the people believed, and while he believed in the effectiveness and responsibility of a political party he also believed that no one individual or a few individuals should take upon themselves the task of either ruling or destroying a political party which would not subjugate itself to an individual will. He believed that reason, justice, and right should be the controlling factor and that men honestly professing the same political faith on broad principles should each be prepared and willing to give and take.

Mr. Jefferson stated very clearly his views on this point in the following language. Said he:

If we do not learn to sacrifice small differences of opinion, we can never act together. Every man can not have his way in all things. If his own opinion prevails at some times, he should acquiesce on seeing that of others preponderate at others. I tolerate with the utmost latitude the right of others to differ from me in opinion without imputing to them criminality. I know too well the weakness and uncertainty of human reason to wonder at its different results. Both of our political parties, at least the honest portion of them, agree conscientiously in the same object—the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good. One side believes it best done by one composition of the governing powers; the others by a different one. One fears most the ignorance of the people; the other the selfishness of rulers independent of them. Which is right, time and experience will prove. We think that one side of this experiment has been long enough tried and proved not to promote the good of the many, and that the other has not been fairly and sufficiently tried. Our opponents think the reverse. With whichever opinion the body of the Nation concurs that must prevail. My anxieties on the subject will never carry me beyond the use of fair and honorable means, of truth and reason; nor have they ever lessened the esteem for moral worth, nor alienated my affections from a single friend, who did not just withdraw himself.

No man in America or elsewhere was more profoundly informed on theories of government than was Mr. Jefferson. Yet he was frequently criticized by his enemies, not only on political matters but on religious as well. Even some people for whom he was giving his time and talent and sacrificing his fortune and health that he might build for them and succeeding generations an imperishable government accused him of being an atheist. Now, whatever he was, that he was not. However, we may question his orthodoxy, we can not question his belief in an Almighty and All-Wise Providence, unless we question his sincerity. That he regarded the All-Wise as being concerned in the welfare and progress of men and nations,

and that he desired to encourage a becoming reverence for Him, is apparent in all his more formal state papers. In his second inaugural address he had this to say:

I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessities and comforts of life, who has covered our infancy with His providence, and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join with me in supplications that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations.

The student of history is so familiar with the great services of Mr. Jefferson as minister to foreign governments, as a Representative of the United States, and with his services as Secretary of State under General Washington, as Vice President with Mr. Adams, and as President of the United States that it is unnecessary here to comment on the brilliant career and thorough usefulness he was to our country in each of these important positions.

The long and arduous public service of Mr. Jefferson proved a great strain upon him at times both physically and financially. He was zealous at all times to serve the public best, notwithstanding his valuable service it was not at all times appreciated by a part of a misunderstanding public and his political enemies were always eager and ready to criticize him. Feeling the strain of his intensive public service, Mr. Jefferson asserted his feeling in the following language:

The happiest moments of my life have been the few which I have passed at home in the bosom of my family. Employment anywhere else is burning the candle of life in perfect waste for the individual himself. I have no complaint against anybody. I have had more of the confidence of my country than my share. I only say that public employment contributes neither to advantage or happiness. It is but honorable exile from one's family and affairs.

Mr. Jefferson enjoyed the fullest confidence of General Washington. Mr. Washington had great faith in his honesty, integrity, ability, and his profound statesmanship. Mr. Jefferson, tiring under the strain of arduous public service, tendered his resignation on December 31, 1793, as a member of General Washington's Cabinet. The instrument was couched in terms of the warmest cordiality and profoundest respect toward President Washington. President Washington had, in vain, appealed to him to remain in the Cabinet, but failing to induce Mr. Jefferson to do so, finally accepted his resignation, as evidenced by the following letter:

DEAR SIR: Since it has been impossible to prevail upon you to forego any longer the indulgence of your desire for private life, the event, however anxious I am to avert it, must be submitted to. But I can not suffer you to leave your station without assuring you that the opinion which I have formed of your integrity and talents, and which dictated your original nomination, has been confirmed by the fullest experience, and that both have been displayed in the discharge of your duty. Let a conviction of my most earnest prayers for your happiness accompany you in your retirement; and while I accept, with the warmest thanks, your solicitude for my welfare, I beg you to believe that I am, dear sir, yours, etc.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

The unprejudiced student of history and political science can reach no conclusion other than that Thomas Jefferson was perhaps the most useful statesman that ever lived and labored in this or any other country. The thinker and the unbiased author inevitably comes to the conclusion that for ability to interpret the will of the people from the most humble citizen to the aristocrat, Mr. Jefferson was not excelled.

He was a diplomat of the highest order, a statesman of unimpeachable integrity, and with a far-seeing vision. His highest and greatest ambition was to be of service to his fellow man, and it was of the most insignificant concern to him whether any open manifestation of appreciation was given so long as he could render a real service to the masses of the people. He understood as well, perhaps, as anyone who has ever trod the paths of trial, struggle, and excessive effort that after all the real test of mankind in public service was his willingness, desire, and effort to serve well those whom he had the honor to represent and who had intrusted him with their confidence.

Of course, he would not be human had he not been grateful for the confidence in him and the appreciation of his work that the public, generally speaking, at the time of his service had for him and his work. While he was far more modest than is usual with men in either public or private life, he must have known that the people of his time and the unending generations to follow were served well.

When the evening shades of life were gathering he said:

I have sometimes asked myself whether my country is the better for having lived at all. I do not know that it is. I have been the instrument of doing the following things, but they would have been done by others—

Said Mr. Jefferson—

some of them perhaps a little better.

Among the many things accomplished by Mr. Jefferson suffice it to mention but a few.

He was the author of the Declaration of Independence.

An act putting an end to entail.

The act changing the course of descents and giving the inheritance to all the children equally under the law, thereby destroying the primogeniture and preventing the property of a person dying all going to the oldest son. That of itself, written into the laws of America, justified his having lived.

The act prohibiting the importation of slaves.

While President of the United States Mr. Jefferson called the attention of Congress in his sixth annual message to the approach of the period, January 1, 1808, at which time constitutional authority might be interposed to stop the foreign slave trade, and in 1814, in writing to Edward Coles, his letter discloses the penetrating character of his mind into the matters of public concern, as in the letter he has this to say:

Yet the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time. It will come; and whether brought on by the generous energy of our own minds or by the bloody process of San Domingo, is a leaf of our history not yet turned.

Mr. Jefferson prepared the act which was passed guaranteeing to every citizen the right of religious worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Mr. Jefferson was known as the father of the Virginia University, by reason of his encouragement and great anxiety concerning the facilities of education. He believed that a well-developed mind was one of the safeguards for the perpetuity of liberty, freedom, and the essential fundamentals of the American Government.

Mr. Jefferson, more than anyone else, was responsible for the well-defined balancing power of the Constitution of the United States. He was the father of the Declaration of Independence; the father of the University of Virginia; the father of the Democratic Party, which has lived longer, surviving on the same fundamental principles, than any other political party to this day. [Applause.]

And, so long as the principles of the Constitution are thoroughly adhered to and so long as the eternal principles of the Declaration of Independence are enshrined in the hearts and minds of American citizens, and so long as the fundamental principles of government in which Mr. Jefferson so strongly believed and for which he in effect gave the entire services of his life, just so long will liberty, freedom, and happiness be secured to that country which has been a benefactor of his life.

#### MR. JEFFERSON IN RETIREMENT

Mr. Jefferson found that while in politics his own private business had been neglected and much loss of property and mismanagement by those in charge had followed, and as he went back to his plantation he wrote a friend:

True patience and perseverance must be the remedy; and the maxim of your letter, "slow and sure," is no less a good one in agriculture as in politics.

Through the spring of 1826 Jefferson's health failed rapidly. He still took his daily ride on horseback, refusing to be accompanied by a servant; but before the summer he had grown too weak to move from his chair and couch. His mind, however, retained its power and clearness throughout. He read much in the Bible and in the Greek tragedians, and wrote several letters of some length, the last being dated June 24. It was an acknowledgment of an invitation to be present in Washington City at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of American Independence.

From the middle of June the strength still left in his once powerful frame rapidly declined, and he quietly breathed his last shortly after midday of July 4, a few hours after his old colleague, opponent, and devoted friend, John Adams, had passed away. Jefferson was laid to rest by the side of the wife whom he had so fondly loved and within sight of the stately buildings to which the thought and activity of his last years had been devoted. On his simple tombstone is the inscription:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia. Born April 2, 1743, O. S. Died July 4, 1826.

[Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the time at my disposal will be used in an effort to call the attention of the House, and I hope the country, to happenings, teachings, and tendencies which, in my humble judgment, neither bode well for the best interests of the people nor for the safety of the Republic.

What I shall say, the observations I shall make, the conclusions I shall reach, and the remedy I shall propose will be wholly nonpartisan, and I hope you will believe me when I say that in accepting this opportunity I have been moved by a deep sense of official duty and wholly by patriotic impulses.

There come times in the lives of nations, as in individuals, when it appears wise to pause a moment, to review the trails already traveled, to take stock of the present and to make plans and estimates for the future, and I here make bold to assert that the time has now arrived for us to stop, to examine the chart, and to seriously consider the alleged symptoms of the alleged decay and alleged decline of the American Republic.

Criticisms of the practices of to-day, of the policies of Government, and of the tendencies of the times are nation-wide and are heard upon every hand.

Before I proceed further permit me to say that I am proud to reflect that I am a humble Member of the Congress of the United States, the law-making branch of the richest, the strongest, and the most influential Nation of this or any other time, and, Mr. Chairman, I am not yet ready to admit that the genius, the valor, and the patriotism of the fathers who created this Nation and the brains, the brawn, and the ability which have builded it will ever permit the old ship of state to drift upon the rocks.

To-day I have unshaken confidence in the ability of the people to govern themselves; I have unbounded confidence in the wisdom set forth in the provisions of the Constitution; and I have unlimited confidence in the ultimate government which the people will develop under such Constitution here in the United States of America. Yet I am perplexed, I am shocked, and I am stunned when I am forced to take notice of some of the teachings, some of the admissions, and some of the tendencies I hear and see upon every hand. That to which I have just referred is contained in the current literature of to-day as well as in the popular speech of the times. Through books, magazines, newspapers, editorials, sermons, lectures, and addresses doctrines are being broadcast which constitute a mass indictment of the Congress, an impeachment of its membership, and a challenge of the ability, integrity, and patriotism of the representatives of the people in this the most perfect government yet devised by the genius of man.

If these indictments and impeachments are false, they must be met, explained, and set aside; but if true, the Nation is in danger, and the people, acting through their Representatives here, are its only savior.

What are these alleged symptoms of danger and disaster? Are they true, or are they false?

My purpose will be served by referring to them briefly, and to assist in their presentation I will group the charges.

It is charged that our civilization is breaking down.

It is charged that there is being developed here in Washington a centralized bureaucratic government in which the people are losing control.

It is charged that the centralization of the powers of Government in Washington is destroying the sovereignty of the States and thereby robbing the people of their inalienable rights to local self-government.

It is charged that taxation is increasing more rapidly than population or wealth and that unless such increase is checked the burden upon the taxpayers will soon become unbearable.

It is charged that through special legislation transportation, finance, and industry have been favored and that through indifference and neglect agriculture has been slighted and almost destroyed.

It is charged that the Constitution is being abandoned and that parliamentary government has broken down.

The Congress is openly condemned and its efficiency and ability publicly challenged.

Some make bold to declare that the American system is no longer suited to the needs of our country.

Our Constitution and our form of government are challenged not by demagogues alone, not only by the sincere and misinformed, but by able and determined men who believe that the American system is no longer suitable to modern conditions.

As a remedy some of our responsible and respectable citizens are inferentially if not openly adroitly suggesting steps looking to a single leadership and a dictator form of government.



If such charges are being made—be they false or true—if such propaganda is being broadcast, it is time to act, and only the Congress itself can be looked to for a remedy.

Permit me now to call your attention to a few of the concrete illustrations upon which the foregoing is predicated.

Frank R. Kent, writing in the December Harpers Magazine upon the topic, "The political decline of America," says:

No open-minded man with an inquiring disposition who travels much about this country can very well help feeling pessimistic about it politically. Speaking not at all from the party but wholly from the public angle, it is in a sorry, soggy, sloppy state.

The truth is that as things are to-day, there are only two classes pleased with the country politically. One of these is composed of those who, directly or indirectly, profit one way or another from politics. The other embraces those who either do not know the facts or can not understand them.

In concluding his article, Mr. Kent asks the following questions:

Is the country too big to govern itself well?

Is there a point in the development of a democracy where it becomes too unwieldy to work as such?

Is the United States approaching that point and are we entering a transition period?

Has not the theory of a government by the people bogged down?

Julian Ames, in a magazine article, entitled "Is civilization breaking down?" says:

For the first time in the history of this country, perhaps, men and women with more than ordinary claims to scientific knowledge are asking themselves, seriously, whether civilization is not actually breaking down.

"Scientific inquiry," says Mr. Ames, "has made it reasonably clear that a number of cultures which may be dignified with the name of civilizations have arisen, come to full flower, and declined. Within the range of history as we know it there have been several such—the ancient Greek civilization, held by some to be fully the equal of our own; Roman civilization, in some degree the spiritual heir and successor of the Greek; the Saracenic civilization, which burned itself out in a brief flare of a few centuries; and finally our civilization of to-day, the future of which, to some historians and sociologists, is so dubious."

On January 24, 1926, the Metropolitan papers carried a syndicated signed article by Willis J. Ballinger, under a headline flowing full across the page, as follows:

Rickety Federal machine is badly in need of repairs.

The story carried less pretentious titles, as follows:

Bureaus usurp many powers of Government.

Tendency now is to belittle legislatures and executive powers.

In the body of the story, under a black-face subhead, "Dictators meet favor," we find the following paragraph:

All over the world there is a disposition to belittle the legislatures and exalt the executives. Even dictators are spoken of with favor. The Soviets have nullified their legislatures and assembled all power in the hands of seven men. In Greece the Premier has announced that he will rule without the legislature and by the aid of the army and "public conscience"; Mussolini is the Government in Italy; Spain and Bulgaria are under executive domination; Venezuela, Bolivia, and Peru to the south of us have adopted the fashion of one-man executive government. In our own country there is a decided movement on foot to burlesque our Congress as incompetent and to eulogize the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government.

At another point Mr. Ballinger, quoting C. E. McGuire, an author of international reputation, says:

Congress is slowly losing its power to a multitude of executive bureaucrats. The rescue of the National Legislature from this invasion of its prerogatives is the most important concern of the American people to-day.

After pointing out that the Government is "out of focus"; that the "executive machinery grows rapidly"; that the "public is unacquainted with the situation," the writer concludes that "In the last analysis Congress is to blame."

On the same day and in the same paper there appeared another syndicated article from the pen of Frank H. Simonds, likewise under a full-page headline, as follows:

Dictators grow in favor in continental Europe.

In the half-page story Mr. Simonds portrays the European failure of parliamentary governments, and makes this significant admission:

But to-day if you consider the European situation it is plain that the attempt of parliaments to regain control has in almost all cases worked badly. At the present hour, the single continental government which is succeeding in anything like a successful fashion is that of Mussolini.

Only recently a noted preacher in the capital of my State in his Sunday morning sermon asserted that American civilization is going the way to death older civilizations have gone; that America is doing what preceding civilizations have done; and that unless a halt is somehow called our civilization is doomed. The Daily Oklahoman, in commenting upon this sermon editorially, said:

Interesting, indeed, and fairly startling; but, after all, what can be done about it?

Modern nations persist in repeating the mistakes of the ancients, they commit the follies of the ancients, they blindly go the way of the ancients, and ultimately they sink into a tomb from which there is no promise of a resurrection.

Ever since the morning stars sang the birth song of a new world, forest trees and men and nations have sprung from life seed to live, flourish, weaken, and finally perish. Many a nation has flung its boundaries beyond sea and mountain and in the might of world dominion has dreamed of national immortality, but like Adam's sons and forest trees each has succumbed to maladies from which no nation is immune and has gone into the oblivion of the dead.

Students of history easily diagnose the ills that weaken and finally destroy nations, but their diagnoses ever go unheeded. After all, is it possible for short-lived and mortal men to create an immortal civilization? Let the answer come from the ghosts that wall among the ruins of Karnak and keep watch among the tombs of Troy.

A few days later the editorial writer in the paper mentioned said:

More than once in days gone by the Daily Oklahoman has mentioned the striking uniformity with which free governments proceed through five stages of government in their journey from national independence to national destruction. For it is startling, indeed, to reflect that absolute despotism, parliamentary freedom, factional or bloc control, unlimited dictatorship, and absolute despotism again appear with pitiless regularity in the history of many nations.

If this rule of the cycles were absolute and unvarying, it would be possible to diagnose the ills of American Government and determine with mathematical exactness just where our Government is to-day. For certainly we have had the despotism of King George, from which revolution freed us, the parliamentary freedom of more than a century, and we now unquestionably have in Congress multiplied blocs and factions that deny all party control. If the factionalism now prevailing is sufficiently strong to paralyze responsible government, and if our Government follows the road that so many other free governments have followed, then we are almost ready to receive the man on horseback and see an absolute dictator set up shop in Washington.

On January 16 last the Associated Press reported that Senator WADSWORTH, in an address delivered at the fifth annual luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club, New York, predicted that we would soon have a "great imperial Government at Washington."

Again, in a current magazine article the Senator says:

The greatest danger is the tendency toward the breaking down of the principle of local self-government and the creation of an all-powerful Federal bureaucracy. This creation of commission, boards, and bureaus has resulted in establishing at Washington, with branches all over the country, a vast governmental machinery so powerful and so complicated that the average citizen is utterly unable to comprehend it. Further centralization of power and assumption of governmental functions will certainly hamper the ability of the people to govern themselves in the States and in their home communities.

A few days ago Ed Overholser, president of a large western chamber of commerce, in an address said:

In the last three weeks I have attended three civic club luncheons where three separate speakers have all chosen the same topic for their address. The whole burden of their thought has been that our Government can not endure more than a few years unless there is a drastic change of sentiment and respect toward law and law enforcement.

When this subject is a common topic of conversation wherever men gather together, and when men of the standing and intelligence I have mentioned are all concerned and agreed regarding the instability of our Government, not because of our form of government but because of the attitude of our citizens, there is a demand for some quick, sound thinking.

On January 17 Senator WHEELER, in an address at Baltimore, is reported to have said:

Our greatest danger is the tendency to drift away from our anchorage of representative order in defiance of the will of the people as expressed by their representative bodies.

If this country had a man in the White House with the courage of Mussolini, he might set himself as a dictator and abolish Congress, and he would have the enthusiastic support of some of our great financiers, profiteers, and industrial overlords.

Recently Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, in addressing the Florida State Legislature on the subject of "The centralization of government," said:

The truth is, one of the most dangerous tendencies of the time is this disposition to deny or ignore the right of local self-government, to limit or restrict the authority and powers of the State, and assume or vest control and power in the Federal Government, contrary to the conception and purposes of the founders of the Republic.

The Washington Evening Star quotes Will P. Kennedy as follows:

The great issue—

Says Mr. Kennedy—

Is whether we shall continue to function upon the principles wrought out by the founding fathers, or shall we go still further outside of the Constitution and continue to change slowly but surely our form of government from that of a Republic to a pure democracy, on the one hand, or a strong central government with autocratic tendencies, on the other.

Some years ago we used to live strictly by the Constitution, but talked little about it; by a strange paradox to-day we are talking a great deal more about the Constitution and getting further away from it in our lives. What shall the harvest be?

On October 13 Gov. Frank O. Lowden, in addressing a class in citizenship at the University of Chicago, was reported by the Associated Press to have said:

That America's governmental machinery is hopelessly out of date; that our Government is "moribund with bureaucracy, enmeshed helplessly in its own twining red tape"; that "democratic government, as America is practicing it, is a failure at the moment."

Only recently an influential lecturer and highly read publicist is reported to have said:

Within a few years the America of our fathers will either be saved or lost.

On March 5 the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] said:

A most intelligent gentleman said to me only a few days ago: "TUCKER, your grandchildren will live to see the day when this Constitution is no longer in existence."

Senator BORAH, in addressing the United States Senate on April 22, 1924, fixed the time for the downfall of the Republic at 30 years.

In the preface of Henry Litchfield West's book entitled "Federal Power" we find the following:

We know that the character of our Government as designed by its founders is already rapidly changing and that we are less prone than heretofore to regard our Constitution as a sacred and inviolable instrument. There is a possibility, with the integrity of the State as an essential unit disappearing, that we may be brought face to face with a one-man bureaucratic autocracy.

On March 13 the Washington Post, in reporting a lecture, said:

Alluding to the reaction in Europe against democracy in favor of "one-man power," James M. Beck, former Solicitor General, in his second address on the Constitution, last night, under auspices of the Georgetown School of Foreign Service, warned that America is not free from the danger of a social revolt.

To-day half of the oldest nations of Europe are in the grasp of dictators.

Mr. Beck said: "At no time within the memory of living man has Lincoln's ideal of a 'government of and by and for the people' been more openly denied and flouted."

High officials realize the danger confronting the people and the Government.

Secretary Hoover, in addressing the thirty-seventh annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Public Utilities Commissioners, condemned "centralized bureaucracy," and is reported to have said:

Our Government was devised in spirit to sustain a dual purpose—to protect our people among nations by a great national power, and to preserve individual freedom by local self-government.

Mr. Hoover warned against the evils of too much government in Washington and gave voice to a fear that our present system of government—State and Federal—can not survive if the States continue to shift their responsibility to the Federal Government.

Commenting on this speech, the Washington Post said editorially:

Secretary Hoover has sounded a clarion note of warning. Unless this tendency ceases, State sovereignty, State rights, and State responsibility in the administration of local affairs must eventually disappear. The dual form of government founded by the fathers must be maintained. It is time for the American people to ponder seriously on this subject and bring both State and Federal Governments back to the system that best suits a people enjoying local self-government.

On May 30, 1925, President Coolidge, standing in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington in the presence of the unknown soldier and thousands of patriotic Americans, living and dead, joined in this warning to the country:

We shall not correct admitted and grave defects—

Said the President—

If we hesitate to recognize them. We must be frank with ourselves. We ought to be our own harshest critics.

What America needs is to hold to its ancient and well-charted course. Our country was conceived in the theory of local self-government. It has been dedicated by long practice to that wise and beneficent policy. It is the foundation principle of our system of liberty. It makes the largest promise to the freedom and development of the individual. Its preservation is worth all the effort and all the sacrifice that it may last. It can not be denied that the present tendency is not in harmony with this spirit.

In that solemn address the President forecast in the following words the future of America unless the present trend of government is changed:

If we can not govern ourselves—

Says President Coolidge—

if we can not observe the law, nothing remains but to have some one else govern us, to have the law enforced against us, and to step down from the honorable abiding place of freedom to the ignominious abode of servitude.

I now here pause to ask, What is the cause of this well-nigh universal complaint against the status of the Government established by the fathers?

Wherein are we going wrong?

What must we do to be saved?

Permit me to give you some of the things alleged to be wrong and also some of the suggested remedies:

E. H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation, is of the opinion that—

The worst thing we have is our American Congress.

Orin Lester, of Chicago, in addressing the American Bankers' Association in New York recently, is reported to have said:

With such agencies at work in the country as bolshevism and the present United States Congress, we have some job on our hands to maintain the integrity of the Nation and the security of her institutions.

Otto H. Kahn, head of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., in addressing a luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association a few days ago, proposed a remedy for our ills and suggested that Mussolini has—

substituted efficient, energetic, and progressive processes of government for parliamentary wrangling and wasteful and impotent bureaucracy.

The Wall Street Journal is in complete agreement with Messrs. Gary, Lester, and Kahn. On December 30 this publication printed an editorial under the heading "Democracy's weakness," in which the following language is used:

Ours was designed as a republican form of government, and there is no form in the history of the world more successful or more enduring. Democracies are replaced by despotism when they degenerate into mob rule. The countries which are getting on their feet in Europe, with the single, if important, exception of Great Britain, are now ruled by dictators.

The purposes and ability of Congress are challenged in an editorial printed in the Journal of Commerce, a Broadway, New York, publication, under date of December 24, 1925, and in the following language:

Yet it remains true that parliamentarism is undoubtedly decadent. In none of the representative bodies of the world does either the personnel or the quality of legislation measure up to that of comparatively recent times.



After arguing satisfactorily to itself that present parliamentary systems have broken down, the article concludes:

Whatever may be the explanation of existing conditions, it is perfectly true, as Mussolini indicates, that the public at large is dissatisfied with its representation, yet does not know how to correct the condition complained of. All sorts of mechanical methods have been tried—direct primaries, "Australian" ballots, anticorruption laws, and manifold others. The fact remains that what is needed is more public spirit and ability. Instead of that we have the bloc system in Congress, and perhaps the most selfish standards of legislative conduct that have manifested themselves for many years. Of all countries, perhaps the United States is in the best position to reexamine its constitutional system with a view to finding out what can be done by quiet, normal means to obtain better results. It would be well if some body of public-spirited citizens should undertake this task, for there is no indication of its being assumed by those to whom it is naturally intrusted—the legislators and public men of the day.

The editorial just read was written by one of the best thinkers in America. Mr. Henry Parker Willis reflects that we are not hopelessly lost and suggests that a—

body of public-spirited citizens should undertake the task—

Of—

finding out what can be done by quiet, normal means to obtain better results.

During the past few months and at this time, it appears to be open season for criticizing the Government, which means criticism of the American people themselves.

Within the last few weeks the distinguished parliamentary authority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Luce], in an interview, reported by Will P. Kennedy, gave expression to the following sentiments, opinions, and conclusions:

This country must begin seriously to commence making changes in its system of representative government.

Again:

There probably has never been a time when the legislative branch of Government, both national and State, has been held in such low esteem as it is to-day.

And again:

The trend abroad toward absolutism and dictatorship is highly significant and even more so is the cry for single leadership.

Our distinguished colleague, after cataloguing the parliamentary failures in Europe, after admitting the depths of low esteem in which Congress has fallen, gives his explanation of the causes of parliamentary decadence as follows:

It may be then that the basic cause for the present disfavor in which representative assemblies are held is really to be found in their inability to cope with present-day conditions.

Can it be true that even some of the trusted representatives of the people are coming to doubt their own ability to pilot the ship, to man the ship, and to guide it safely around the rocks and through the breakers to safety?

Mr. Chairman, are the people being asked to consider the problems and decide the issues, or are they already being prepared for what is to come?

Perhaps the station which I occupy in this Chamber does not warrant me in making these observations. As time goes, I have been here for but a moment. I come from the plains and prairies of the West. I do not have the honor of representing soil carved from the original Colonies and populated by descendants of the heroes of the Revolution—yet I do represent here a district of American soil populated by original Americans and hardy pioneers as patriotic as any in the land.

Before proceeding further, I would like to ask my critical and despairing colleague from Massachusetts, Does not the monument still stand on Bunker Hill?

Is not Faneuil Hall still the "Cradle of Liberty"?

Is not the Liberty Bell still in place in Independence Hall?

Are not pilgrimages in frequency and in number constantly increasing to Mount Vernon and Monticello?

Mr. Chairman, I hold the faith that so long as even the recorded memory of these sacred institutions last popular government will not perish from the earth.

I ask again, why this pyramiding of criticisms, charges, and condemnations of the Government we have been taught to revere and love? Do causes exist justifying the charges made?

What about the charge that there is being developed in Washington a centralized bureaucratic Government in which the people are losing control and which is destroying the sovereignty of the States?

Let Senator Albert J. Beveridge answer!

In his book, entitled "The State of the Nation," Senator Beveridge says that we suffer from a plague of laws and that practically every law now passed creates a new bureau or board.

Confirming what the Senator says, let me divert to call attention to the major bills just passed by the House in the present Congress.

The law styled "revenue act of 1926" creates a Board of Tax Appeals, consisting of 16 members, with the customary assistants, clerks, stenographers, and messengers.

The Parker railway labor bill creates a board of mediation as an independent agency of government, such board consisting of five members, with the usual assistants, experts, agents, and clerks.

The Elliott public building bill delegates authority to locate and construct public buildings to the Secretary of the Treasury, and also authorizes the Secretary to employ such technical, scientific, and clerical assistance in Washington and in the field as he deems necessary, and to fix such rates of compensation therefor as he deems proper.

The White radio bill establishes the Federal radio commission with five commissioners, with such clerks, experts, examiners, and such other employees as it may find necessary.

This Congress is not yet through creating bureaus. On February 7 the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House the text of a bill proposing to create not one but two new Federal bureaus, and on March 16 the bill was approved by the Ways and Means Committee and started on its way to enactment. In this approved bill we find the following provision:

The Secretary of the Treasury may delegate to the commissioner of customs such powers and direct him to perform such duties as the Secretary may deem advisable.

In this pending proposal we have a last-minute confession that the Congress is overwhelming the Government with bureaucracy; and, secondly, a similar admission that we already have one fair-sized dictator in our constantly increasing governmental army.

My objections to the growing system of bureaucracy is that when the Congress outlines a policy for the protection of the public and creates a bureau or commission to execute such policy, immediately the interest to be regulated and controlled by such bureau "gets busy" and soon we find that such bureau is manned by managers of the special interest's own selection, and the bureau, instead of protecting the people, is soon functioning as a protection to the very interest which the Congress intended to curb and regulate; hence I am suggesting that a number of existing bureaus should be either abolished or transferred to the direct control and supervision of proper committees of Congress.

Under the present system when a bureau is once created and established it is lost to congressional control, and thereafter all we can do is to criticize, condemn, investigate, and threaten to abolish.

Back to the answer to my question.

We are largely governed by a bureaucracy—

Says Senator Beveridge—

Bureaus investigate business, bureaus direct productive industry, bureaus prescribe commercial methods, bureaus require elaborate reports from all sorts of enterprises; in short, Government bureaus have become the commanding element in the economic life of the American people.

All this means a gigantic enlargement of the public pay roll. The Civil Service Commission states that at the present moment there are 548,566 employees of the National Government, and thinks that by June 30, 1924, the number will be 555,607. Yet in 1916 these Federal employees totaled 438,037. The late figures do not include more than 50,000 other officials. To the whole must be added 157,362 employees who are not in the classified civil service.

Again says Senator Beveridge:

Every 11 workers over 16 years of age support 1 Government employee. The aggregate salaries of this vast army of public servants is \$3,800,000,000 annually.

Many consider the increase of bureaus, boards, and commissions as the natural and desirable result of our complex civilization. Yet the historical fact is that the bureaucratic idea and practice was an offspring of autocracy. For example, bureaucracy was one of the many causes of the French Revolution. Under the ancient régime there were swarms and hosts of government officials and agents. There were even

inspectors of cattle and inspectors of calves, inspectors of swine, and inspectors of suckling pigs. In short, government intruded into every transaction of life.

Nobody could live except as the Government directed. And since the Government made itself responsible for everything, it was blamed for everything.

Climaxing his answer, this distinguished author and statesman said:

And the French Revolution came, and with it the overthrow of special privilege and autocratic oppression.

Only a few days ago a number of the Members on this floor received letters from the editor of a western farm paper containing the following paragraph:

Corrections will come like another did in 1776, when Washington and his band of ragged farmers took the whole of this country away from England; or it will come like it did in 1863, when a rail splitter, elevated to the Presidency, by proclamation, took every slave away from slaveholders.

There is ample precedent for the confiscation of property when property becomes a menace.

What about the charge that taxation is increasing more rapidly than population and wealth, and if not checked the people will be felled by their tax burdens?

Some time ago President Coolidge said that—

The total tax burden of the people was \$10,000,000,000 annually.

The Philadelphia Public Ledger made an investigation of the statement of the President and in an editorial set forth the following analysis of this gigantic tax receipt, such analysis being for the year 1923:

Taxes collected and expended for Washington departments, bureaus, and agencies.....	\$3,459,000,000
Taxes collected and expended for State governments.....	1,450,000,000
Taxes collected and expended for support of local, county, city, town, and township governments.....	5,136,000,000
Such sums totaling.....	10,045,000,000

In 1925, or in two years' time, the total tax burden of the people increased from ten billion to eleven and one-half billion dollars.

According to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1925 all the reporting national, State, and private banks on June 30, 1925, had total cash in vaults in the sum of \$951,286,000. Thus it will be seen that the total tax burden of the people in 1925 was eleven times the total amount of gold, silver, and paper money in all the 20,000 banks in the United States.

According to the report of the Division of Loans and Currency on March 1, 1926, there was cash in circulation outside the Treasury in the total sum of \$4,814,217,046. Thus it will be seen that the people must earn all the money in circulation two and one-half times each year in order to meet the present burden of taxes levied against them and their property.

Government is costing the people per capita three and one-half times what it cost 20 years ago and six times per person what it cost 40 years ago. Congress alone is not to blame. The States, cities, counties, townships, and districts are equally at fault, but Congress sets the style and fixes the pace.

In 1878 it cost \$291,000,000 to operate the National Government. In 1885 it cost \$336,000,000.

In 1901 it cost \$463,000,000, in 1905 it cost \$781,000,000, and in 1909 the country was shocked by the first billion-dollar Congress.

Thereafter it cost around a billion dollars a year until the war, when during the years 1917, 1918, and 1919 we raised and spent in excess of \$47,500,000,000.

In 1922 our national expenses were \$2,900,000,000, and this year, 1926, we will spend approximately \$4,150,000,000.

In his recent message to Congress the President said:

We have about reached the time when the legitimate business of Government can not be carried on at a less expenditure \* \* \* the operating costs have been reduced to nearly a minimum.

The question naturally arises, Why this rapid doubling and quadrupling of public expenses? Some may answer that the war is to blame, and the war is a factor. We are carrying a \$20,000,000,000 war debt and enlarged overhead expenses, brought on by the war, but the war is not wholly the culprit.

The public seems to think that governmental services, expenditures, and subsidies are gifts, and do not realize that all the time they are paying the bills. In the past decade State and Federal bureaus have increased tenfold. These burdens are managed, as Senator Beveridge says, by swarms of employees—bureau chiefs, assistants, inspectors, deputies, sub-deputies, chief clerks, clerks, file clerks, stenographers, mes-

sengers, and doorkeepers—all tax fed and tax maintained. For 10 workers there is 1 tax eater. Under the present system most of these employees are necessary, and, as the population and national wealth increase, the number of employees absolutely necessary will likewise increase; but what is the low limit of the number of workers who can be taxed to support one public employee?

Senator Capper asks:

Is there a time coming when every citizen will have one officeholder to support? The idea is extravagant, but its realization is not impossible.

Continuing, the Senator says:

By 1860 this 1 to 1,000 ratio in officeholders had increased to 1 to 100. In the late eighties and early nineties the proportion was 1 to 10. To-day it must be greater, however incredible the thought may seem.

We now have 94 of these subdivisions of Government. Twenty years ago there were only 14.

Then, here at Washington we have a number of independent administrative boards that are little governments, governments within government, like the United States Shipping Board, which recently defied the President. Some of them contain an unnecessary number of men and are answerable to nobody in particular, even themselves.

Who created all these "little governments"—boards, bureaus, and commissions?

The answer is, The Congress with the approval of the President.

Who is responsible for their continued existence? Again the answer, The Congress and the President.

Permit me to call attention to one other charge—that agriculture has been overlooked, slighted, and almost destroyed.

A few days ago Dr. William Edward Dodd, professor of American history at the University of Chicago, in addressing the university women in that city, said—

The farmer, like the Indian, is a "vanishing American."

He predicted that the final result would be the merging of the present farming class into a peasant class, such as exists in Europe, while the land would come to be owned in vast estates by men of great wealth.

Doctor Dodd suggests that the farmers, the largest single class of our people, have already permitted industry to secure at the hands of Congress tariff subsidies; have permitted the railroads to secure rate subsidies; and have permitted the larger financial institutions of the North and East to secure control of the money of the country; and are facing bankruptcy and economic slavery.

So serious has the farmers' problems become that special delegations from 11 Western States are here now appearing before congressional committees petitioning and pleading for help. Industrial leaders of the North and East are heeding the admonition and warning sounded by Secretary Hoover, and have become suddenly interested in the threatening collapse of agriculture. A study and analysis of the farm situation discloses that farm expenses increased 60 per cent from 1880 to 1900; increased 100 per cent from 1900 to 1910, and increased 600 per cent from 1910 to 1920. In this 20-year period farm labor increased 90 per cent, operating costs increased 116 per cent, and the combined costs per unit increased 300 per cent.

During the five years just before the war the net return on farm investment was 5½ per cent. During the five years just after the war the net return was 4 per cent, and the investigation further shows that the net return to-day is only 2 per cent.

These returns are manifestly too small as disclosed by the rate of farm failures which from 1910 to 1924 increased over 1,000 per cent in contrast to the record of commercial failures.

To-day the farmer finds himself living under economic conditions wherein all about him are boasting of unparalleled prosperity, yet the more he plants, the harder he works, the more he reaps the poorer he becomes. He does not understand why he is unable to pay his taxes, why he can not meet his interest obligations, and why he can not support his family on the farm; and in despair he falls under the ever increasing burden, abandons the homestead, and goes forth to seek employment in the mines, mills, or public works.

Painful as it is, we must admit that there is a rapidly growing conviction in the country, in the Government, and in truth upon this floor that we are drifting upon a perilous sea; that the rush of centralized power and authority here in Washington is increasing at an alarming rate; that the activities of the Government are so numerous and expensive that taxation is increasing more rapidly than either population or wealth; and



that unless a halt is called and a policy formulated and followed, trouble, the seriousness of which can not be foretold, is inevitable.

Congress is now, and has been from the first, the architect of the Nation. The structure we have Congress has provided. If the charges now being made are true, partially true, partially false, or wholly false, it is time for the Congress to take notice and begin serious consideration of the state of the Nation before it is too late. If there is nothing wrong; if the high officials, publicists, and governmental critics are mistaken in their predictions and fears, the country should be so assured. If, however, clouds are gathering, assembling potential danger, then the Congress, representing the people, should warn them of the approaching storm.

This grave responsibility resting upon this membership can not be shifted. We are hired and paid to do this work. The citizen, busy with his private business, has neither time nor facilities for solving public problems, save with his vote on election day. But give the people the facts, the issues, and a program and they will make the decisions.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the people may have the facts from which issues may be developed, a program outlined and remedies proposed, I have introduced House Resolution No. 180, which, for the information of the House, and in my time, I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee, consisting of seven members, be appointed by the Speaker, said committee to be authorized and directed to extend, on behalf of the House of Representatives, formal invitations to certain citizens of the United States, inviting such citizens to prepare and deliver to such committee such suggestions, criticisms, and comments upon the present status and tendencies of the Government of the United States, which, in their opinion, will be helpful to the people and their public servants in keeping the Government operating in the best interests of the people of the United States.

The said committee is authorized and directed to extend such invitations to the following persons:

- To ex-Presidents of the United States.
- To ex-candidates for President of the United States, nominated by national political parties.
- To ex-members of the United States Supreme Court.
- To ex-Cabinet members.
- To ex-governors of the several States.
- To ex-Members of the United States Senate who served more than one term.
- To ex-Members of the House of Representatives who served more than 10 years.
- To such other persons as the committee may select.

The said committee is authorized and directed to collect such statements, submitted in response to such invitations, and, when collected, to present same collectively for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The said committee is further authorized to make recommendations to the House for the publication and distribution of such statements to the end that same may have the widest possible circulation among the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, some may say that the resolution, if agreed to, would create another governmental bureau and occasion additional expense to the taxpayers of the country, but such is not the case. The printing of sufficient stationery for the invitations, the writing of a few hundred letters, and the printing of the replies would constitute the total bill of costs.

Others may charge that the Congress by the passage of the resolution admits its inability to solve the problems which confront the country, but such likewise is not the case, as the resolution is intended to aid rather than relieve the Members in this work from which they can not escape.

Some may condemn the Congress for asking aid when no remedy is either suggested or proposed. No doubt but that each Member of the Congress could outline a program which would, in his judgment, solve all troubles which confront the Nation.

Had I the power to influence, I would confer, consider, and decide upon just what national activities in which the Federal Government, under the Constitution, could, should, and would engage—all other powers being reserved for exercise by the States.

I would confer, consider, and decide upon the abolishment of some of the existing bureaus, boards, and commissions; others I would consolidate; and still others—legislative in character—I would transfer and place directly under the supervision of the proper committee or committees of the Congress. The Tariff Commission, for example, instead of being an alleged independ-

ent bureau, should in reality be a fact-finding agency for the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

In considering the agricultural problem I would follow precedents which we have seen industry, transportation, and labor successfully establish here during the past few years; such precedents having been established by the selection of some of the best brains of the country and charging same with the task of finding a solution, preparing a program, proposing legislation, and explaining same through Congress, such a program, backed by confident and confidence-inspiring ability and by 40,000,000 people with an aggregate wealth of \$80,000,000,000 would be irresistible. Men who have taken nonessential industry, broken-down transportation, and disorganized labor and piloted such groups to prosperity can surely take agriculture—the Nation's greatest necessity—and save it from decay and dissolution.

I still have faith that the day will come when Secretary Hoover, instead of pleading with financial and industrial leaders to press lightly upon the farmer, will see agriculture organized and prosperous and able to meet all other groups and interests in every field wherever found.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that my resolution proposes for the Nation the same precedent which was invoked to save finance, industry, transportation, and labor, and which I have just suggested for agriculture.

In brief, the resolution proposes to extend on behalf of the House of Representatives an official invitation to the most experienced and capable governmental diagnosticians the country affords; men who have been already honored by their countrymen; men who are not candidates for public office and who have nothing to gain save the opportunity to justify the confidence heretofore and herein reposed in them; and men again signally honored, as never before, by the opportunity of submitting to present and succeeding generations addresses which we profoundly hope may in a degree be comparable to the immortal farewell of the Father of his Country.

These are my convictions and the reasons for my faith and action. Institutions and governments do not protect themselves. Into our hands as temporary guardians the safety and destiny of American institutions and the American Government have been committed. To the end that this Government as outlined and established by the fathers may be preserved and in an effort to be of service, I submit this proposal to the House and to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING]. [Applause.]

OUR INDUSTRIAL EMPIRE ASSAULTS THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman—

Thou who hast  
The fatal gift of beauty.

(Byron.)

The day is dark for Liberty. Her shrine is still worshipped by a dauntless few. Her multitudinous friends of prosperity have been driven into darkness by the oncoming and materialistic god of production. The spirit of freedom wanes and the Harpies of standardization seek to overwhelm and strangle it, while whole peoples for whom the blood of many generations has run that they might breathe the air of freedom acclaim the dictatorships, boldly announcing that the people are tired of liberty and that freedom is passé, while in America, the erstwhile home of independence, the Lamonts and the Ottokahns sing high praises to the doctrine of internationalism and the expiatory scene of American liberty.

From the time of the Northumbrian overlordship, which followed the conquest of Britain by its English conquerors in the fifth century after the birth of Christ, down to the present time, the power of overlordism as a positive element in the relation of man to man has never been abolished, devitalized, nor reduced. It maintains its permanency from two sources. On the one hand it thrives from the powerful persistency of the ambitious and overriding boss, and on the other it is most wonderfully preserved by that crying lackeyism which finds peace and quiet in being bossed.

Our forefathers built for us a government of wise laws, but in the ravages of time the personnel which they supplied for the administration of these laws has long since passed beyond. Our forefathers built for us a government of wise laws administered by as wise a personnel. The laws have stood well, but the personnel has departed, until now all key positions have been slowly, surely, and insidiously usurped in executive and bureaucratic governmental activities by direct or indirect representation of American Overlordism.

By the aid of vast sums of money contributed by the willing or frightened rich, and supporting a dangerous and corrupting

control of public opinion through that instrument which was once the handmaiden of freedom, the printing press, with the aid of the rostrum, the radio, the poet, the stage, supplemented at all times by a mendicant professoriate joined to a mentally debauched and commercialized literati, a vast University of Propaganda has been built and is now in activity, and so with its educated and unscrupulous thanes of organized wealth the American house of Overlords now autoeractically rules in the United States. A list of the membership of this American house of Overlords is easily obtainable. Suffice it to say for the present that the woolstack of this house is held down by the fundament of Lord Elbert Gary, whose glorious history has been presented in dignified book form by Ida Tarbell, erstwhile the she St. George of the people. The cause of Philippine independence in the American house of overlords looks dark. A second and deeper glance shows us that in this house of power the cause of American freedom and independence looks doubly dark. Juggernaut has sold his services and the services of his car to the American house of Overlords and is driving recklessly on toward the destruction of parliamentarianism, representation of the people in Government, and the eventual abolishment of Congress.

Just now we are to witness the full concentration of the power of the overlords to crush any and all hope for justice and liberty for the Philippine Islands. It is the duty of every American citizen who loves liberty himself to see that this attack by big business, organized and armed, to lay low this attempt on the part of the Philippine Islands to obtain a promised independence is defeated; for if this attempt to throttle all hopes of Philippine independence is successful in this instance, then the current onslaught by organized industrial and financial overlordism on the liberties of the individual American citizen may be more easily carried to a successful issue in the elimination of the precious legacies of liberty handed down by the fathers.

Doctrinarianism is the basis of all public activities of the American house of overlords. Specious dogma and its broadcasting by the doctrinaire in commerce is the main and most frequently used method of molding the minds of the masses into a state of bewilderment and submission to the strategy of the overlords. They have learned that dogma well stated, reiterated and eternally restated, answers the demand for the control of mass mentality better than an adherence to the truth, for they harmonize with Newman, who said:

Many a man will live and die upon the dogma; no man will be a martyr for a conclusion.

"Subterraneanism" is the method of approach and endeavor used in all personal, political, private, and governmental enterprises of the American house of overlords. Their thanes, their agents, procurators, procuresses, and panderers are perfectly familiar with the serpentine windings of the underground tracks, trails, and spaces, and with their darkness and their dankness, where stealthily and scientifically the expert work of "boring from within" goes safely on.

The American house of overlords works "in mysterious ways its wonders to perform." Deep in the subsoil of intrigue its footings are first securely placed. A policy once decided upon is always the result of the discussion and the suggestions of the best minds of the country, and which only organized money can command. And when the plan is released to view it always appears disguised as a great benefit to humanity or as a boon to patriotism. At once what is designated as a campaign of education begins. And thereupon the subsidiary and auxiliary aids to the house of overlords rush into the fields of publicity in exploitation of the scheme so previously laid, always carefully concealing its enmity to the true interests of the people.

Every member of the House, or at least every group thereof, is supposed to maintain by virtue of his or their wealth a paper organization, having a post-office address and a secretariat. Among the strongest of these organizations who "thunder in the index" for the benefit of their creators are to be noted the National Civic Federation, the National Defense League, Mr. Morgan's Federation of the Churches of Christ in America (God save the mark).

Luncheons are held by these aids, the newspaper boys are invited thereto, and the willing chief ethical editor of the metropolitan paper gives a column to the unsuspecting public of the resolutions passed and the sentiments expressed at the party. The university of propaganda is lighted up and put to work, and the paid poets, professors, publicists, experts, economists from Standard Oil, General Electric, Carnegie, and other foundations, by controlled voice and by fettered print and by microphone, in one grand diapason and reaching to the

utmost parts of our Nation, give full vent to all the luring songs designed to disarm and corrupt the public mind.

I desire to deal with only one subject which has been considered by the American house of overlords and upon which it has issued its ukase, to wit, the destruction of Philippine independence and the crushing of all Philippine aspirations therefor.

The fight of the Filipinos for freedom is not a fight with the American people, but with the overlordism from whose tyranny they themselves suffer.

Mr. Richard Oglesby Marsh, representing the American Association for the Advancement of Science, testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House as late as the 22d day of January last, in the face of a grim gathering of witnesses, who had just cried in unison, "Down with liberty and up with rubber!" was bold enough to inject into the hearing a piece of truth when he said:

Many Americans and all Filipinos consider America pledged to give the Filipinos their freedom when reasonably qualified. During the Wilson administration the Senate refused their independence by one vote. If it should appear that America retained the Philippines for the commercial exploitation of its rubber output, it would arouse much adverse criticism and opposition, both at home and abroad.

Yes; "stable government" is the "open sesame" to Philippine independence.

The magna charta of the Philippine Islands, known as the Jones law, proclaims:

It has always been the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.

If there is anything sure and fixed among God's people on earth, it is this plain pledge of the American Congress, this certain covenant of ultimate freedom so universally understood by the land of the palm and pine and by the land of the free and the home of the brave.

But how is it now that after more than a quarter of a century of our adherence to the principle of nonexploitation of the Philippines, enunciated by President McKinley, we find ourselves apparently and suddenly about face, led by a rapaciousness only equaled by that of the early Spanish conquistador.

In 1295 Marco Polo arrived in Venice from the Far East. In deference to the goddess of publicity he caused a magnificent entertainment to be prepared in his own house, where an elaborate luncheon, sprinkled with a few bottles of "bootleg," was quietly served. All the members of the Venetian Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Clubs, including many other rich and celebrated Babbitts, were there. When the cloth was removed and the domestics had been ordered to withdraw, Marco Polo, with his two traveling companions, went into an adjoining room and presently returned clothed in the three threadbare suits in which they had first returned to Venice.

With the assistance of knives, they proceeded to rip the seams and to strip off the lining and patches with which these rags were doubled, and by this operation brought to view a large quantity of most costly jewels, such as rubies, sapphires, carbuncles, diamonds, and emeralds, which had been sewn into them, and with so much art and contrivance as not to be at all liable to the suspicion of containing such treasures.

All this as a protection against highwaymen. The display of wealth, so incalculable in its amount which then lay exposed on the table before them, appeared something miraculous, and filled the minds of all who were spectators of it with such wonder that for a time they remained motionless. Upon recovering from their ecstasy they felt entirely convinced of the truth of their report and the identity of Marco Polo and the countries in which he had traveled and had made representation, and they accordingly exhibited every mark of profound respect for their host.

So Marco Polo in this spectacular incident and in the history of his travels addressed to "ye emperors, kings, dukes, marquises, earls, and knights, who read this book," unfolded and disclosed the glories and the exploitative resources of ancient Cathay.

So, duplicating history in a late year of our Lord, one Mr. Joseph W. Harriman, president of the Harriman National Bank, of New York, returned from his five weeks' cruise on his steam yacht among the Philippine Islands. Like an American Marco Polo he disclosed and unfolded to his colleagues of the American house of overlords the glories and the exploitative riches of these wonderful islands. He dwelt upon the possibilities of the transmutation of these resources into the jewels, bonds, stocks, and modern liquid assets of the monopolists of wealth,



the accumulation of which might again swell the coffers of their war savings. As one of these influential members and of the same harmonious "kidney" he laid before them the details of this transmutable wealth. In eloquence he spoke of the vast tract of uncultivated and fertile lands, mahogany forests, rattans, hemlock, oak bark, bamboo, and the hundred kinds of native woods and of the wonderful prospects for the development of sawmills and the great market in China for lumber ready to be demanded from the 40,000 square miles of forest. Earnestly he depicted the vast sugar plantations and their vast possibilities. The coconut grove, orange, and banana farms, the corn, the honey, and pineapples excited the wonderment of his hearers. Nipa alcohol, copal, turpentine, coral, hemp, and palm trees excited his audience to visions of larger and additional fortunes. The scenery, the birds, and the fish surrounded all by a celestial paradise was a picture for the contemplation of only those already supplied with large wealth and which they alone could understand. As with the wealthy and ancient traders of Venice the story of Cathay appeared miraculous and filled them with motionless wonderment, so Lord Harriman was received with profound respect and his story readily believed. Supplemented by the book of Rambles in the Philippines of this American Marco Polo, the easily obtained resources of the Philippine Islands were firmly impressed upon the grasping minds of greed. So when in eloquence and enthusiasm our great hero and knight pealed out a peroration as follows:

Why, then, back home are we so anxious to give away a land that abounds with splendid possibilities and opportunities and when, 20 years from now, if our population continues to grow, we shall need all its raw materials for home consumption? Why we should buy of them instead of owning them?—

the excitement of the overlords knew no bounds and proper action was then taken to perfect their possession of and their title to Philippine resources.

All our national obligations made in the past by men who elected by the people were then brushed aside by this house of power as obsolete and archaic. The Philippine bill of rights, which, by the Representatives of the people in Congress, solemnly recognized independence for the islands as soon as the stable government was established, were discarded with a slight winch on the Woolsack when Lord Gary declared that Congress was the worst thing they had on their hands.

The overlords in their deliberations ignore all promises, precedents, and obligations when they come in contact with the exigencies controlling the accumulation of wealth. The John Hooks of the present, as in the days of the Revolution, "are bawling aloud beef, beef," in the camp of liberty, and pressing their designs of selfishness in defiance of right and justice.

No matter to the overlords that George Washington said:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations.

That Thomas Jefferson said:

The people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights.

That Daniel Webster said:

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulder, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country he will not, he can not, and he means not to be happy under its burden.

That the martyred Lincoln said:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God can not long retain it.

Nor is it even material that President Grant as early as 1865 expressed the idea with reference to Cuba, that as soon as the Cuban people have set up a stable government their independence would be recognized; with what little moment the wisdom of President Cleveland is regarded when said:

The government of a remote and alien people should have no permanent place in the purposes of our national life.

And what do they care if it has been long our established custom of producing and maintaining freedom as reiterated by President McKinley:

A stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligation, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of the citizens as well as our own—

or when he later spoke to the Philippine commissioners and said:

In all the forms of government and the administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe, the commission should bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views,

but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government.

Little are they disturbed because Theodore Roosevelt in his message to Congress in 1908 said:

I hope and believe that these steps (the granting of a legislative assembly and a gradual participation of the Filipinos in their government) mark the beginning of a course which will continue until the Filipinos become fit to decide for themselves whether they desire to be an independent nation.

They regard as immaterial and asinine Roosevelt's remarks when he said in 1915:

If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines from a military standpoint are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go and by its action has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence, without any guaranty whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

All the wisdom of this great man has been thrown into the discard by the clerks of the chamber of the overlords. And the words of Taft, when he said:

Contrast the Filipinos with other Malays and oriental peoples, and I ask you to name a people offering more opportunities for development along the lines which American ideals require than the people of these islands? To begin with, they are a Christian people, and they have been so for 300 years. They have no caste or arbitrary customs to prevent their development along the line of Christian civilization. They differ utterly in these respects from the East Indians, from the Malays of Java, and the Malays of the Straits Settlements, and thus make our problems different from and vastly easier than those of England and Holland.

And, again:

The Philippines are ours not to subjugate but to emancipate.

The words of Stimson:

The postponement of the question of the independence for the islands has been deliberately made, not for promoting our interests but solely in order to enable that momentous question to be determined intelligently by the Philippine people in the light of their own highest interest.

And the words of Woodrow Wilson:

Every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the condition set forth by the Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.

And all this, together with the words of the late President Harding:

No backward step is contemplated, nor diminution of your domestic control.

Have each and all, at least temporarily, been cast into the waste-paper baskets by the janitors of the American House of Overlords.

The scene of operations being laid in the Philippines, the American House of Overlords, through its purchased and trained personnel, first mapped out its field of strategy and local control with Napoleonic fineness.

First the Manila Babbitts and the New York Babbitts were welded into harmonious thought and action. A definite line of propaganda was marked out. The preliminary step, and one which has won the overlords many a victory, was their application of the doctrine of embroilment not only among the Filipinos themselves but between them and the United States. A feeling of doubt, distrust, and perplexity was then sought to be raised. The eight years in which the Filipino people made the most astounding progress, the administration of Governor General Harrison, was assailed, and the effort made to make a political football out of the Philippine question was attempted.

Unfortunately for the entire situation from the standpoint of the American people, but particularly smart from the conquerors' position, a colossal blunder broke. Gen. Leonard

Wood, who had seen long service as a thane of big business, was made Governor General. No one ever accused Woodrow Wilson of being a fool, and of General Wood he is reported to have written, on June 5, 1918, but not published until after the war, a letter the material part of which is as follows:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN:

I am keenly aware of and keenly sensitive to the implication which would be drawn out of the fact that I am not sending General Wood to the other side, and I want personal friends like yourself, upon whose approval I depend for my encouragement, to know why I am not sending him.

In the first place, I am not sending him because General Pershing has said he does not want him and, in the second place, General Pershing's disinclination to have General Wood sent over is only too well founded. Wherever General Wood goes there is controversy and conflict of judgment. On this side of the water we can take care of things of that sort, because the fighting is not being done here, but it would be fatal to let it go on at or anywhere near the front.

I have had a great deal of experience with General Wood. He is a man of unusual ability, but apparently absolutely unable to submit his judgment to those who are superior in command. \* \* \*

Faithfully yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

And after reading this letter, if it portrays the true characteristics of General Wood, I note what our good President said to the Philippine commission on February 21, 1924, and I find he told them, in effect, that General Wood was a good governor general and was not a usurper of authority; that he would be sustained; and the President then invited their most intelligent cooperation in Wood's support. It was his idea that if the Philippine people would not cooperate with Wood's policies their failure would be considered as evidence of their unpreparedness for liberty. In his view, Governor General Wood had at no time been a destroyer of Philippine autonomy; and then I wondered if that commission, consisting all of Philippine citizens who had long been in a position to study at close range the humanitarianism of General Wood, and all in the light of Wilson's illumination, could have had any doubts about the Wood characteristics.

A new detail, now added to the necessary qualifications for Philippine independence on the part of the citizens of that island, has been developed by the present assailment of organized power on the resources and liberties of the island, and in addition to successfully submitting to myriad other tests of qualifications for independence, the Filipino is called upon to enthusiastically support the ideas and policies of General Wood, which are the ideas and policies of the American House of Overlords.

An intelligent cooperation with the personality and the policies of the Governor General now makes "the primrose path" leading to independence.

Like the captives of Procrustes, the Filipinos must be forced into this standardized bed and adjusted thereto either by racking or by amputation.

What are these specifications of our overlords promulgated by General Wood?

First. The echo of that shibboleth of centralized business that "the Government should get out and keep out of business" must under this late test be memorized, adopted, and proclaimed by every Filipino mother's son before even so much as uttering the word independence.

Second. Government ownership is a crime in the dogmatic ritual of the American house of overlords and all Filipinos in their activities should so recognize and punish it before appearing in America seeking liberty. It must be shown that the successful Manila railroad, based upon the examples of our Government ownership in Panama and Alaska, has been absorbed by private pirates in order to be in a position to consistently argue the cause for Philippine freedom.

Third. The pet phrase of the Governor General is that he must have "authority commensurate with responsibility," failing to remember that he has attempted to widen his authority and responsibility beyond the limits of the Philippine bill of rights, which in his first inaugural after his appointment he promised a government of the people through their representatives "to the extent provided by the Jones bill." In spite of all this, by the use of a highly polished and sharpened veto power he has succeeded in keeping from the Filipino people, acting through their duly-elected representatives, whose authority proceeds from the first Filipino constitution—the Jones law—the right to legislate locally for the people of the Philippine Islands and to carry into effect their autonomous rights.

His veto ax has fallen upon a myriad of bills where the Philippine Legislature attempted to exercise the autonomy

granted by the Jones Act. By his acts in this regard "even that which he hath" in the way of local control was taken from the Filipino, and this in violation of the declaration of this Congress that its object was—

to confer upon the Filipino people as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given without in the meantime impairing the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States.

He has grievously disrupted the harmony of the islands by his determination to represent the people of the Philippines as well as the President of the United States. By this method he has "stifled the further development of Philippine public opinion by taking from the leaders their responsibility for domestic affairs."

A single case will illustrate this point:

In 1923 the Philippine Legislature unanimously voted to suspend the penalty for nonpayment of the land tax. Governor General Wood vetoed this act and had President Coolidge kill it with his power of "final" veto. If the Philippine Legislature has not the power to reduce taxes it has, practically speaking, no legislative power at all. The control over taxes is the very essence of legislative power, and while many legislative bodies have surrendered to the executive the exclusive authority to increase taxes, no legislature worthy of the name has surrendered its authority to reduce taxes, and this prominent authority further said:

Scores of other cases could be cited to show how Governor General Wood has taken full personal responsibility for denying to the Filipinos that autonomy in domestic affairs which they exercised from 1918 to 1922. General Wood seems to forget that our policy in the Philippines is not to collect the most taxes nor to run the most efficient government possible. On the contrary, the original policy of McKinley, Root, and Taft, which has been followed by three Republican and two Democratic administrations is a policy of training the Filipinos to govern themselves.

Such methods smack of present-day dictatorship, yet a great and intelligent people craving their ideals are to accept and ratify the loss of their rights before being considered prepared for independence, and to glorify usurpation, and, falling prone, deify the good and beneficent Fernando Cortez of the Philippines.

Fourth. Congress, per Wood's suggestions, is to be memorialized and importuned to reverse itself and repeal all those portions of the Jones Act and all concessions won by them in the last quarter of a century, and the Filipino people and their able leaders are to humbly and silently accept this cumulation of Wood's plans and thereby in part, according to the new conditions, fit themselves for independence. A bill is now in the offing, prepared by the satellites of the American house of overlords for this purpose, and to oppose it would subject any Filipino to the charge that he was disqualifying himself for freedom.

Fifth. Oblivious of the fact that the Jones law does not set up a presidential form of government, and that the Supreme Court has decided that the Constitution does not follow the flag in the Philippines, and that the theory of separation of powers in the light of the United States Constitution has never been a fundamental theory of government in the Philippine Islands, General Wood with military persistency claims that there must exist in the Philippines that form of government which can not under the law in the Philippines so exist, to wit, the Montesquieu theory of the separation of government into legislative, executive, and judicial departments, a system only partially workable in the United States.

In revolutionary France a series of such constitutions failed. There a stable constitution was not found until certain alliances were made between the various forces of the nation in the constitution of 1875. Such is the general arrangement prevailing in European constitutions.

Uncertainty in the stability of Latin-American Republics has been caused largely by reason of their efforts to keep their legislative, executive, and judicial departments divorced each from the other.

The new organization set up in the Philippines under the Jones law and in no way in defiance thereof was not, strictly speaking, the presidential form. Thereunder departmental secretaries, having full responsibility in their offices subject to the supervision of the Governor General, serve during the term of the legislature, at the opening of which they are appointed. Instead of absolute divorce between them and the legislature, on the contrary they may appear voluntarily or on request before either House to be heard on matters affecting their departments. They are united with the leaders of the legislature in one body, the council of state, presided over by the Governor General, constituting at all times a unified and answerable



body, emanating from the people themselves and proceeding effectively. On this subject Hon. Sergio Osmeña, one of the great conservative constitutional lawyers of the world, says:

In the widest development of this system the leaders of the legislature would sit with the Governor General as members of his cabinet.

There is nothing in the Jones law which prohibits this step; it would be in accord with constitutional precedence in the Philippines. It would secure the closest harmony between the executive and legislature, and it would give to the initiative and recommendations of the former in matters of legislation the weight which they would necessarily lack if the executive were to be kept apart from the representatives of the people.

General Wood, with his support and reinforcements, would change all this. This would destroy all collaboration between the heads of departments and the legislature. They would abolish the council of state and shrink the present partial autonomy into nothingness. This opinion may be tolerated for the purpose of consideration, but what reasonable man can conceive that the Filipino patriots must completely reverse their position, throw up their advocacy of autonomy, and coordinate with Wood and the American house of overlords in their plans to destroy it, and all for the purpose of presenting themselves in the white robes of innocence and in the attitude of the abnegation of liberty and expurgated of all desire to dispute General Wood's ideas, so that they may appear qualified to assume their governmental "self-determination" and the independence of their nation.

Such are the present policies of General Wood; yet, if he continues to bring forth and advocate in the future the strategy of organized business in its attack on Philippine independence, he must bring forward the new arguments and plans which have already been agreed upon in the American house of overlords and with a wide publicity have been already carried to Congress and support demanded thereon and likewise urged that all dissent thereto on the part of Philippine patriots will be considered as an argument against their qualifications for ultimate independence, for by their advocates their American Chamber of Commerce in Manila in liaison with the United States Chamber of Commerce, now embedded and powerful in the Capitol, their Mayos, their Johnsons, and their Lyons, all having simultaneously and enthusiastically caught up the clarion cry of Lord Barron himself in his Wall Street sermons—not on the Mount—in 1921 and the shriek of the New York Tribune gloriously announcing that—

with all in sight the practical probability of our withdrawing from the Philippines may be dismissed summarily—

Do they not declare their dogma:

First. That a congressional assertion of the establishment of a territorial government for the Philippines under permanent sovereignty of the United States should be had.

Second. That any claim that the United States made any promise of independence is a lie.

Third. That the preamble to the Jones bill has no legal or moral force.

Fourth. That the statements of our Presidents from McKinley to Harding holding out independence when a stable government is established in the Philippines were made without authority and are not binding on the people of the United States and are therefore to be repudiated.

Fifth. That neither the President nor the Congress of the United States has power to grant liberty to the Philippine people.

Upon these new propositions the American house of lords has "girded up its loins" and hopes to be successful in smothering Philippine independence and in capturing Philippine resources.

Just now the shock troops engaging on behalf of the overlords in the actual contest with the Filipinos in endeavoring to retain their present rights is found in that arm of the service commanded by the rubber barons.

The whole rubber investigation is nothing more than one propaganda "stunt" designed to give publicity to a campaign for the United States to repudiate its promises of freedom and to retain the Filipinos permanently as vassals.

Publicity propaganda is not limited to the voice, to the press, or to the radio, as there are numerous other schemes of laying before the public the arguments and schemes of the business nobles. There are Sulgrave and Alexander Hamilton institutes, American economic societies, foundations, and federations without number.

The greatest publicity plan in working the so-called "educating the public" game is through the means of an investigation—preferably a congressional one.

And so when in early 1923 there seemed to exist bright prospects for the independence of the Philippines the clans of

business met and discussed and laid plans for its ultimate defeat.

Congress, it was agreed, directly or indirectly, must be influenced along the lines of repudiating the promises made to our Philippine friends and toward throwing the islands into a Territory and thereby knocking Philippine independence into a cocked hat.

We have in this country, and they are accessible to the American house of overlords, and perhaps may even rank as brother lords, individuals, who by reason of their civic wantonness, unprincipled education, and brains are able to handle just such big questions. In times gone by such service was rendered in behalf of the State for the benefit of the kings and occasionally for the people, and with Othello, they might say, "I have done the State some service." Now, this service is performed for the benefit of what has been practically substituted for the State—the despotism of big business.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the genius of Herbert Hoover, master adviser of massed money, should be called at once into play. No one understands the legerdemain of business craft better than he, and in the American house of overlords no member stands higher in their honor than Sir Herbert Hoover. Thereupon the injection of the rubber question into the claims for Philippine independence was so diabolically wise that every Plutus in hell roared with glee.

As a scheme for confounding that part of public opinion made up of automobile users by dangling the false and delusive hopes of cheaper rubber tires before them, appealed instantly to the business nobility and Lord Harriman rose and riotously proclaimed—

let the Government assert permanent subjection of the Philippines; the thing to do is to get every man who owns an automobile and who is consequently interested in the future prices of rubber tires to write to Secretary Hoover and his Congressman demanding that this dilatory policy be abandoned.

The plan of choking to death the happiness and self-determination of 10,000,000 people by crude rubber then having been determined upon, the quick movements to that end came thick and fast. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, induced the Congress to appropriate a half a million dollars to investigate the rubber situation in the Philippines, and all with great publicity.

One H. N. Whitford, a slave of the rubber lords and bearing the title of general manager of the crude rubber department of the Rubber Association of America, was placed in Hoover's hands to investigate the subject. Great propagating effect was produced by this appointment.

Almost at the same time Lord Firestone and citizen Henry Ford began to secure large space in the public prints announcing their plans to extend the rubber industry to the Philippines. Meanwhile public attention was being directed to this rubber talk and indirectly to the desires of the Filipinos.

In this manner the propagating work reached a considerable part of the Nation, but not until the Whitford report was made was the big blast let loose. Then it was that every page of every paper in the country was penetrated with its results. Rubber could be raised successfully in the Philippines! The ether above us and around us—now about to be monopolized under a bill just passed by the House as an additional exclusive means of propaganda by our overlords—was permeated with tales of rubber possibilities, and, lo, there also rose the voice of Frederick William Wile, who throws upon the air with somewhat careless regard for exactness that which is never critical and frequently beneficial to our overpowering princes.

Neither by the "Voice of the Capitol" nor by his press reports of the possibilities of raising crude rubber in the Philippines did he ever fail to couple therewith in a most prominent way the dire statement that failure confronted the investment of American capital in rubber enterprises in the Philippines, because such rights of self-determination and autonomy have been accorded to the Philippines that the hazard was too great and that, therefore, before American capital would venture there in rubber raising all our idealistic and nonexploiting efforts there must be abandoned and our erection of a great far eastern republic must cease and the islands transferred into territorial wilds.

In the discussion in the House on the 21st day of December, 1925, when H. Res. 59 was passed, when it was suggested that the investigation was really a propaganda scheme against Philippine independence, it was denied with some few words and with much shaking of the head.

I think our House leaders were honest in their belief that the investigation should touch only the Stevenson or rubber control. However, a careful reading of the evidence taken in the hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee shows that from the very start the question of Philip-

pine independence and the breaking down of Philippine autonomy was to be the main object of the quest, and with fatal persistency the pursuit continues on down into the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 13, 1926, and, as originally planned by the overlords in their fight to hold the resources of the Philippines and as staged by Lord Hoover, recommends an initial compliance by Congress with the demands of the would-be destroyers of Philippine autonomy.

Indeed, Mr. Hoover and the witnesses volunteering from the Rubber Trust and the Department of Commerce were very careful not even to scratch the great rubber control, often apologizing for saying a word which might be construed as stepping on the British toes of some comrade in the English-speaking union, the Sulgrave Manor, or the New York group of non-American international bankers.

The whole affair was staged by Mr. Hoover and the rubber barons, as keen servants of the American overlords, for the purpose of producing material which might be used, as it is in said report, for the purpose of inducing Congress and the country to break down Philippine autonomy by augmenting the powers of the Governor General now advocated by representatives of sinister financial interests through their paid writers and American congressional tourists who claimed to have acquired expert knowledge in the premises because they were at one time in Manila, sat on the veranda of the Manila Hotel, smoked Manila cigars, and read Katherine Mayo's book. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the bill, H. R. 3860, which I have introduced, to amend section 15 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act.

I have frequently said that, in my opinion, the Federal farm loan act is one of the greatest pieces of constructive legislation ever enacted for the benefit of the farmers by Congress. The amendment which I propose provides for the appointment of local agents by the Federal Farm Loan Board in the various localities where local farm-loan associations fail, neglect, or refuse to properly serve the needs of any locality. The amendment confers upon such local agent about the same authority which the secretary-treasurer of a loan association now has. It does not in any material respect change the existing law. The loans which are applied for through applications filed with such agents would continue to be subject to the same conditions and restrictions as if made through the farm loan associations. My contention is that this amendment, if adopted, would greatly popularize the Federal farm loan act and would result in many farmers availing themselves of its provisions and greatly expedite action upon loans by the farm land banks.

This bill (H. R. 3860) has been submitted to the Farm Loan Board and, after most careful consideration, the Farm Loan Board has submitted the following report thereon:

This bill would amend the farm loan act so as to provide that Federal land banks may accept applications for loans through agents in territory where it has been determined that national farm loan associations have not been formed, or that the associations, when formed, neglect or refuse to serve the needs of their territory.

The board does not oppose this legislation, but, on the contrary, believes that it might be of material assistance to eligible farmers in a great many sections of the United States. If your committee should favor the principle of this bill, I shall be very glad to go over the details with you with the thought of assisting in perfecting it.

Section 15 of the rural credits bill, which this bill proposes to amend, provides for the appointment of agents only when no local association has been formed, and the agent to be appointed must be an incorporated bank, trust company, mortgage company, or savings institution, chartered by the State, and this agent is required to indorse and become liable for the payment of the loan. The amount of the loan to be made by such agents is limited to ten times the capital and surplus of such institution. Such agent is permitted to be paid not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent of the unpaid principal of the loan, and this must be deducted from the dividends payable to the borrower, and if no dividends are paid to the borrower, of course, no commission is paid to the agent. There is a further provision that in the event of the organization of a local association no further loans shall be negotiated through the agent so appointed. In my judgment, no bank or trust company can afford to accept the agency under these conditions. None have been appointed, so far as I know, in the State of Oklahoma. None have been appointed where a local association has been formed but ceases to be active. The amendment to which I am directing your attention provides that whenever it ap-

pears to the board that local farm loan associations have not been formed, or such association after having been formed, fails, neglects, or refuses to serve properly the needs of the territory in its locality, it does not require the appointment of a bank or trust company, and the agents appointed are to give bond, serve at the pleasure of the board, and receive as compensation not exceeding 1 per cent of the amount of the loan made, with a minimum fee of \$5 for each loan. When a local association is organized and serves the community, no further loans are made through such agent.

At a previous session, when hearings were had upon a similar bill which I introduced, members of the farm land bank appeared before the committee in person and indorsed the provisions of this proposed amendment.

Under the provisions of the farm loan act of July 17, 1916, a Farm Loan Board was created, with general supervising control over the 12 farm land banks located throughout the country. These land banks are authorized to make loans to farmers upon the amortization plan. They charge the farmer no greater rate of interest than that which they have to pay upon tax-exempt farm land bank bonds which are authorized to be issued and sold, plus the expense of management, and 1 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, is added, to be applied to the reduction of the principal. The last issue of farm land bank bonds bears a rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and were sold to yield 4.28 per cent. If financial conditions improve, a 4 per cent tax-exempt farm land bank bond should sell at par. Treasury certificates offered a few days ago bearing a rate of  $3\frac{3}{4}$  per cent interest were sold at par. The rate of interest charged to the farmers by the farm land banks ranges from 5 to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, in addition to the 1 per cent amortization applied on the principal. The St. Paul bank charges 5 per cent, the Louisville bank 5 per cent, the Omaha bank  $5\frac{1}{4}$  per cent, and the Wichita bank  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and the board hopes in the near future to be able to reduce all these rates to 5 per cent. In the event 4 per cent bonds are issued and sold for par, and it would require payment of 1 per cent for cost of administration and 1 per cent amortization, making the farmers pay 6 per cent, this 6 per cent would pay both principal and interest.

The statement of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau shows net mortgage loans made by the 12 farm land banks to February 28, 1926, totals \$1,019,485,621.16.

The farm land bank located at Wichita, Kans., which serves my district, shows loans to the amount of \$83,301,656.07.

There can no longer be any doubt as to the success of this legislation and of its very great importance to the farmers of the country. When the legislation was enacted many farmers in the West were paying 10 per cent interest on loans and most of them 8 per cent or more, including commissions. Immediately upon the passage of the act interest rates were reduced by mortgage companies and insurance companies making loans in my State, so that a lower rate of interest is now being charged to the farmers and more favorable terms given as to renewals.

What I am trying to do is to popularize this law and to have the farmers generally take an interest in it and avail themselves of its privileges. Many of them do not understand it. They do not appreciate that they can borrow money at 5 per cent or  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, add 1 per cent to be applied to the reduction of the principal, and that by paying 6 per cent or  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest they are paying both principal and interest. If a local agent were appointed in counties where no local loan associations have been formed, or where one has been formed and is not functioning, and if he is permitted to make a minimum charge for his services in advising farmers as to how to take advantage of this law, assist them in initiating loans, make the preliminary preparations, forward their papers to the bank which serves their district, I feel sure that many more farmers would avail themselves of the privileges of the law. The more loans made to the farmers will result in a proportionate reduction of the expense of administration and a gradual reduction of the rate charged. There are approximately 6,500,000 farmers throughout the United States. Including members of their families some 40,000,000 people live on the farm and are directly dependent upon farming for a living. Almost everyone throughout the country is dependent upon the prosperity of the farmer and is directly dependent upon him for his food supplies. Therefore, the prosperity of the farmer affects the entire citizenship of the country.

Now, coming to the amendment which I have been urging, why is it necessary and how would it help to expedite loans and popularize the law and allow more farmers to take advantage of its provisions?

Many farmers, in the first place, are reluctant to join loan associations. They prefer to pay a higher rate of interest to loan companies. In the second place, it has been my expe-



rience, from a study of the local loan associations formed in my district, that when a number of the farmers get together and form such an association and secure their own loans the association is thereafter inactive so far as attempting to induce additional members to take advantage of it.

In my own district, with eight counties, four of them—Adair, McIntosh, Okmulgee, and Sequoyah—have no local loan associations and therefore receive no advantages from the law, except when an applicant for a loan may be attached to an adjoining county, and there are but few of these. The other four counties—Cherokee, Haskell, Muskogee, and Wagoner—have local associations. Up to October 31, 1923, there was loaned through the associations in those four counties as follows: Cherokee County, 37 members, amount of loans \$65,400; Haskell County, 22 members, amount of loans \$39,400; Muskogee County, 29 members, amount of loans \$89,200; and Wagoner County, 42 members, amount of loans \$138,900. During the period from November 1, 1923, to October 31, 1924, only 3 new members were served in Cherokee County, 2 in Haskell County, 2 in Muskogee County, and 1 in Wagoner County; or 8 in all. Total amount loaned aggregated \$39,600. During the period from November 1, 1924, to October 31, 1925, 7 new members were served in Cherokee County, 7 in Haskell County, 2 in Muskogee County, and none in Wagoner County; or a total of 16. To these 16 new members only \$29,200 was loaned during the past year.

The reason for this is plain. Section 7 of the rural credits bill provides for the election of officers of local associations "and a loan committee of three members." All officers, except the secretary-treasurer, serve without compensation. Only the "reasonable expenses of the loan committee" are paid by the association.

Section 10 provides that when a prospective borrower makes application for a loan it shall be first referred to the "loan committee" provided for in section 7 of the act.

The loan committee is required to examine the land offered as security, make a detailed written report signed by all three members, give the appraisal of the land as found by them, and such other information as may be required by the rules and regulations, and no loan can be approved without a favorable report.

The difficulty is in securing an active "loan committee" to function without compensation after they have themselves been served. The above table shows that they have not been active, at least in my district, and therefore the importance of making loans through an agent such as I have proposed in the amendment which I have submitted.

My contention is that this table which I am submitting herewith conclusively shows that the local loan associations, once formed, and after the original charter members secure their money, are not active in pressing the advantages of the law upon others, and inducing them to take advantage of it.

*Statement showing loans closed from organization of the Federal land bank to October 31, 1925, by counties, in second congressional district, State of Oklahoma*

Counties	Organization to Oct. 31, 1923		Nov. 1, 1923, to Oct. 31, 1924		Nov. 1, 1924, to Oct. 31, 1925	
	Number of borrowers	Total amount loaned	Number of borrowers	Total amount loaned	Number of borrowers	Total amount loaned
Adair.....	5	\$9,900	—	—	—	—
Cherokee.....	37	65,400	3	\$10,500	7	\$11,400
Haskell.....	22	39,400	1	7,400	7	15,300
McIntosh.....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Muskogee.....	29	89,200	2	8,200	2	2,500
Okmulgee.....	1	1,000	—	—	—	—
Sequoyah.....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wagoner.....	42	138,900	1	4,500	—	—
Total.....	136	343,800	8	30,600	16	29,200

The total number of loans made up to October 31, 1924, in Oklahoma was 6,592, to which number was loaned the sum of \$18,204,000.85.

Loans may be made to the amount of 50 per cent of the appraised value of the land and 20 per cent of the appraised value of the insured, permanent improvements.

If a local agent, to whom would be paid a minimum fixed fee for his compensation, were appointed in each county to represent the farm land bank serving that district, he would be able to familiarize the farmers with the requirements of the law, aid them in preparing their papers, and would be able to give them such information as to procedure and as to the

amount they could probably secure on their lands, thereby minimizing the number of loans rejected and expedite the consideration of all applications for loans. In my judgment, this is a matter of great importance to the farmers throughout the country. Everybody appreciates that the farmers have been depressed during the past few years, and we have been endeavoring to find a proper solution for their problems. I have taken occasion heretofore to say that in my judgment it will require the enactment of a series of bills to solve the problems of the farmers. I wish to emphasize this particular amendment which I am pressing upon the attention of the Members of the House. I believe that if this amendment were enacted it would aid many of the worthy, thrifty, honest, and economical tenant farmers to own their own farms.

The Census Bureau reports that in Oklahoma there are 197,218 farms. Of these, 81,226 are operated by their owners, 115,498 by tenant farmers, and 494 by managers.

I want to make it possible for every tenant farmer to own his own home. If I have any hobby it is to help every man to live on his own land. The enactment of this amendment would do much to accomplish that. The local agent could bring to the attention of the tenant farmers the advantages of this law and would show him how to make his application, and this would encourage him to try to buy a farm for himself and would result in untold thousands of them buying small tracts of land, giving the first mortgage to the farm land banks, and giving a second mortgage for the balance of the purchase price. He would be enabled to pay off his loan to the farm land bank through a long-time loan and through industry, thrift, and economy he would be able to gradually pay off the second mortgage and finally own his home.

Now, let us examine the benefits that would result from this. When a man owns his own land he conserves the soil, he rotates the crops, diversifies the products he plants; he uses his spare hours in repairing and building improvements, he terraces the land to prevent the soil from washing away, he fills up the ditches, he puts out a small orchard, and gives more attention to studying the crops adapted to the particular soil which he owns. In this way of caring for and cultivating the land it is made stronger and more productive and enables the farmer to raise at least 50 per cent more per acre at but little, if any, greater expense. The taxes are no greater and the cost of maintenance is about the same.

Now, if the farmers, through better methods, are enabled to raise 50 per cent more corn, wheat, cotton, alfalfa, and other products upon the same acreage, he has that much more to sell and has therefore reduced the cost of production. It necessarily adds greatly to his prosperity and correspondingly adds to the prosperity of the community and the entire Nation.

Agriculture is our basic industry, and this is particularly true of my district. Every person living in the towns and cities is largely dependent upon the farmer and is as deeply interested in the prosperity of the farmer as the farmer is himself. Every merchant, banker, laboring or professional man is interested in legislation which will be of advantage to the farmer.

If we can, by legislation, make it possible for the farmer to borrow money for long terms at low rates of interest, it will encourage more farmers to own their own homes and will surely add to their prosperity and to that of the entire country as well.

This bill will not weaken the present law but will strengthen and popularize it and I hope to continue to press it upon the attention of Congress until this or some similar amendment receives favorable consideration. In the meantime I want to urge upon the people of my State and the country the advisability of their studying the provisions of this law, forming local associations and taking advantage of its terms.

The provisions of the rural credits bill can only be availed of by the owners of farms or those desiring to purchase farm lands. Loans are made only to purchase farms, pay off mortgages, purchase equipment, fertilizer, and livestock, to provide buildings and other improvements of farm lands, and no loan can be made at a greater rate of interest than 6 per cent. The original act was a splendid piece of constructive legislation. It should be amended as I have indicated. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAWLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10425, the legislative appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

## GREAT LAKES TO THE ATLANTIC DEEP WATERWAY

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a summary on the St. Lawrence waterway by Mr. C. P. Craig and ex-Governor H. L. Harding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I am submitting herewith a brief presented on behalf of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, by Mr. Charles P. Craig and Mr. W. L. Harding, covering economic and navigation features of the report of the special board on preliminary examination on the deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River:

This brief on the facts is presented to your honorable board by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association to support the conclusions reached by the special engineering board created by act of Congress to make survey and findings on the matter of connecting the Great Lakes with the Hudson River, and thence with the ocean.

We support the conclusions of the report now under consideration, namely, that a ship canal across New York State connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean via the Hudson River be not recommended for the reason that the construction of the proposed waterway would not result in benefits commensurate with the required expenditure and further sustain the report on the following grounds:

(1) It is conceded by even the proponents of a New York route that the Great Lakes should and of right ought to be connected by a deep-water navigation route to the ocean.

(2) It is the claim of the Great Lakes territory that they are justly entitled to—

- (a) The natural way out to the sea.
- (b) The way beset with the least navigation hindrances or restrictions.
- (c) The way that 30-foot-draft ocean vessels can and will navigate.
- (d) The way that is economically feasible.
- (e) The way that is engineeringly most feasible.
- (f) The only way that is practical from a navigation standpoint.
- (g) The way where there is an abundant supply of water.
- (h) The way where there is opportunity for yet greater development as trade increases.

(i) The way free from overhead bridges and beset with only seven locks in three flights.

(j) The way that will serve the grain-producing portion of the country best.

(k) The way that will serve the foreign and domestic trade of each and every part of the whole United States.

(3) The report should be sustained in its conclusions because—

(a) Eighty-two bridges and 20 locks make navigation slow, tedious, and impracticable.

(b) The 25-foot maximum depth available in the Oswego-Hudson route does not supply present demands for deep shipping out from the Great Lakes.

(c) One hundred and sixty miles of restricted channel is at best only second-class navigation.

(d) The route from Oswego to the Hudson requires a lift of 123.6 feet and a drop of 379 feet; in all a total lockage of 512.6 feet.

(e) The Oswego-Hudson route across New York is not the shortest distance in either mileage or sailing time to the world markets in which the north Mississippi Valley is vitally interested.

(f) The Oswego-Hudson route will complete the isolation of all New England by removing her from the sea lane of commerce.

(g) The Mississippi River serves all the territory in foreign trade not served best by the St. Lawrence so far as mileage is concerned.

(h) The New York barge system now serves lower New York State and the metropolitan district.

(4) The report should be sustained because the Great Lakes territory and all of the United States are entitled to the best route connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean.

(5) The connection of the Great Lakes with the ocean via the St. Lawrence is not, as commonly understood, an inland waterway improvement. It is, in fact and in truth, extending an arm of the ocean inland and giving the northern part of the United States practically ocean shore line, thus developing all of the possible ocean ports of the United States.

## I. BRIEF OUTLINE OF IMPORTANT REPORTS

## DEMAND FOR ADEQUATE CHANNEL TO THE SEA

For more than a century there has been a well-founded demand for an adequate waterway connecting the Great Lakes with the sea. The history of this demand carries us back to the days when the steamboat was still a dream and ocean transportation was conducted solely in clipper ships and other sail crafts, whose drafts averaged but 8 to 12

feet. Vessels sailing on the Great Lakes had an average draft even less than this. As late as 1840 a full cargo of grain on the Great Lakes comprised only 3,000 bushels, or less than 100 tons.

The first steamer on the Great Lakes was built in 1816, and up to 1820 only 4 steamers had been built on the Lakes, as compared with 71 on the western rivers and 52 on the Atlantic coast. In the next 10 years 8 steamers were built on the Lakes, and 1 of these in 1832 made the first trip from Lake Erie to Chicago.

The Erie Canal, begun in 1817 and opened October 6, 1825, provided a water route for grain from the Illinois prairies to reach the populated districts along the Atlantic coast and to enter the channels of foreign trade through North Atlantic ports. The canal was 4 feet deep and 40 feet wide, and could float boats carrying 30 tons of freight. It was subsequently enlarged and deepened to 6 feet, but not before the question of constructing a canal between Lakes Erie and Ontario suitable for the passage of lake vessels had become a real issue.

Navigation between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario was made possible for the first time in 1829 when the Welland Canal was completed and opened to navigation. By 1846 this canal had been given a depth of 9 feet, and by 1887 it had been still further enlarged to provide a depth of 14 feet. The Oswego branch of the Erie Canal was begun in 1825 and finished in 1828. It was enlarged to provide a depth of 7 feet in 1862.

## SHIP CHANNEL INVESTIGATIONS

The earliest official reports were confined to the construction of a canal from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario. The depths considered in these earlier projects, while wholly insufficient for present-day ocean and lake shipping, were suitable for vessels of the type at that time operating on the Great Lakes.

It will not be necessary to mention all the early reports submitted by authorities of the Government and of the State of New York, with respect to a ship channel between Lakes Erie and Ontario and between Lake Ontario and tidewater. A few of the various investigations are of outstanding interest, however, and furnish the basic data upon which later estimates and conclusions have been predicated.

Pursuant to the sundry civil act of March 2, 1895, the President appointed a commission composed of Messrs. James B. Angell, John E. Russell, and Lyman E. Cooley. The item of law authorizing this commission was as follows:

"Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to appoint immediately after the passage of this joint resolution three persons, who shall have power to meet and confer with any similar committee which may be appointed by the Government of Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada, and who shall make inquiry and report whether it is feasible to build such canals as shall enable vessels engaged in ocean commerce to pass to and fro between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, with an adequate and controllable supply of water for continual use, where such canals can be most conveniently located, and the probable cost of the same, with estimates in detail; and if any part of the same shall be built in the territory of Canada, what regulations or treaty arrangements will be necessary between the United States and Great Britain to preserve the free use of such canals to the people of this country at all times; and all necessary facts and considerations relating to the construction and use of deep-water channels between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean."

The commission submitted its report on January 8, 1897, which was published as House Document No. 192, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session. This report will hereinafter be referred to as the report of the Deep Waterways Commission. It will be noted from the item of law authorizing this investigation that it contemplated a study by Canada as well as the United States. Soon after the personnel of the United States commission was announced the Dominion of Canada appointed three commissioners, who cooperated with the United States commissioners in the consideration of the problems involved.

In compliance with the river and harbor act of June 3, 1896, Maj. T. W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, made an estimate of the "cost of construction of a ship canal by the most practical route wholly within the United States from the Great Lakes to the navigable waters of the Hudson River, of sufficient capacity to transport the tonnage of the Lakes to the sea." This report was submitted under date of June 23, 1897, and is printed in House Document No. 86, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session. It will hereinafter be referred to as the Symons report.

Under a provision in the sundry civil act of June 4, 1897, a board of engineers, consisting of Maj. Chas. W. Raymond, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Alfred Noble, and George Y. Wisner, were appointed to make "surveys and examinations (including estimate of cost) of deep waterways and the routes thereof between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic tidewaters, as recommended by the report of the Deep Waterways Commission." This was the first actual survey of the complete routes to the seaboard, and the data acquired by the investigation have formed the basis of all subsequent reports. The report of the board was submitted under date of June 30, 1900, and is published in House Document No. 149, Fifty-sixth Congress, second



session. It will be hereinafter referred to as the report of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways. The surveys covered two routes between Lake Erie and Ontario, one from La Salle to Lewiston and the other from Tonawanda to Olcott; also two routes from Lake Ontario to tidewater, one by way of the St. Lawrence River, Lake Champlain, and the Hudson River and the other by way of Oswego, Oneida Lake, Mohawk River, and Hudson River.

The river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, ordered a preliminary examination of "such routes between the Great Lakes and the Hudson River as may be considered practical by the Chief of Engineers, with a view to securing a waterway admitting ocean-going vessels to the Great Lakes." This report was submitted by Lieut. Col. Clarke S. Smith, Corps of Engineers, on April 27, 1920. This report is published in House Document No. 890, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session.

The river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, contained the following item:

"SEC. 9. That the International Joint Commission created by the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington, January 11, 1909, under the provisions of article 9 of said treaty, is requested to investigate what further improvement of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario is necessary to make the same navigable for ocean-going vessels, together with the estimated cost thereof, and report to the Government of the Dominion of Canada and to the Congress of the United States, with its recommendations for cooperation by the United States with the Dominion of Canada in the improvement of said river."

The report of the commission was submitted under date of December 19, 1921, and is published in Senate Document No. 114, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session. The engineering data and estimates of cost are contained in a special report by Col. W. P. Wooten, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and Mr. W. A. Bowden, chief engineer, department of railways and canals, of Canada. An investigation of the transportation and economic aspects of the project was made by Dr. R. S. MacElwee and Alfred H. Ritter. Both of these reports were forwarded to Congress as appendices to the report of the International Joint Commission.

The report of the International Joint Commission, referred to above, was favorable to the development of the St. Lawrence waterway, and it embodied recommendations for further study of the engineering data. On March 14, 1924, the President of the United States appointed a commission, known as the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States, to:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, March 14, 1924.

HON. HERBERT HOOVER,

Secretary of Commerce.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In appointing the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States under your chairmanship I desire to set out my views as to the work that the commission can properly undertake.

It is my desire that the commission should thoroughly consider the whole project in its economic and national aspects, should solicit the views of the various sections of the community, should be able to express an opinion as to whether or not the project should be undertaken at the present time. If this judgment should be in the affirmative, then I wish the commission to consider the formulation of such projects as might be submitted for international agreement on construction, finance, and administration, all of which of course must be of a preliminary nature as a basis for formal negotiations with the Canadian Government and obviously subject to the views of Congress.

In order that the work of the commission shall be coordinated with the joint engineering investigations suggested in the correspondence with the Canadian Government, I am to-day asking that the War Department place under your direction the necessary engineering officers and you will, as Secretary of Commerce, represent our Government in these matters.

The project of opening the Great Lakes to ocean-going ships and development of the great power resources of the St. Lawrence River, on behalf of both the Canadian and American people, has been a hope long treasured by many millions of our people, and it is in the desire that this matter, if it is sound and practicable, should be brought one step nearer to consummation that I am asking you and your fellow commissioners to serve in this matter.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

The personnel of this commission is as follows:

Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, chairman.  
William C. Breed, attorney at law, New York City, former president New York Merchants' Association.  
Charles L. Allen, Worcester, Mass.  
James E. Davidson, Bay City, Mich., vice president American Ship Building Co., Bay City.  
James P. Goodrich, Winchester, Ind., formerly Governor of Indiana.  
James R. Howard, Chicago, Ill., formerly president American Farm Bureau Federation.  
James D. Noonan, American Federation of Labor.

Stephen B. Davis, Washington, D. C., counsel.

Charles P. Craig, Duluth, Minn., executive secretary.

To advise the commission in reference to the engineering questions involved, a board of three officers of the Corps of Engineers was appointed and funds appropriated for necessary surveys. Said board has not made its report. The commission aforesaid can not conclude its study of this project and make its report to the President until after the report of the International Board of Engineers has been made available.

Under the terms of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1925, a special board of engineers was appointed to make a preliminary examination and survey of a deep waterway "from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River suitable for vessels of a draft of 20 or 25 feet, said board to make use, so far as applicable, of the existing data and to make its report on or before May 1, 1926."

In addition to the studies of the Federal Government, the State of New York has at various times given consideration to the question of constructing a waterway wholly within that State. The successful competition of the railroads with the Erie Canal, resulting in the loss of much of the canal's through traffic, made it necessary for the State to determine whether the canal should be abandoned, enlarged so as to meet the requirements of 1,000-ton barges, or still further enlarged to meet the requirements of ships.

On March 8, 1899, Governor Roosevelt appointed a body of seven men to serve on what was known as the committee on canals. This committee consisted of Gen. Francis V. Greene, George E. Green, John N. Scatterd, Maj. Thomas W. Symons, Frank S. Witherbee, Edward A. Bond, and John N. Partridge. Major Symons had already expressed his views on the relative advantages of a ship canal and a barge canal in the Federal report, already referred to, submitted by him in 1897. The report of the committee on canals was submitted to the governor on January 15, 1900. This report will be hereinafter referred to as the report of the State committee on canals.

As a result of the recommendation of the State committee on canals in favor of a waterway for 1,000-ton barges in preference to a ship canal, a survey to develop a project for this improvement was made by the State engineer, and his report thereon was submitted to the governor on February 12, 1901. This report is known as the Preliminary Barge Canal Survey.

Following the passage of the barge canal law in 1903, adopting dimensions differing from those proposed in the Preliminary Barge Canal Survey report new plans and specifications were required. On March 3, 1904, the governor appointed an advisory board of consulting engineers. The work of this board related to purely engineering questions connected with the construction work, and the various reports submitted are not of interest to the problems now under consideration.

## II. ROUTES, PLANS, AND ESTIMATES

In the reports of the Deep Waterways Commission it was stated that "all deep-water routes to the eastern seaboard are restricted to two outlets, the St. Lawrence River from Montreal to the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the north, and the Hudson River from Troy to the Atlantic Ocean at New York." From Lake Huron to Montreal and to Troy various routes and combinations of routes had been advocated by different interests, of which the following were the most generally discussed:

- (a) The natural route via Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River to Montreal.
- (b) A route similar to (a), but having a diversion from the St. Lawrence River, via Lake Champlain to Troy.
- (c) An alternative route from Lake Ontario to Troy via the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk Valley.
- (d) A route via the direct line from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario at Toronto.
- (e) The Ottawa route via the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers to Montreal, with an additional link from the St. Lawrence River via Lake Champlain to Troy. This line eliminates Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.
- (f) A route from Lake Erie along the general course of the Erie Canal.

Routes (d) and (e) involve the elimination of Lakes Erie and Ontario from the through channel from Lakes Superior and Michigan to the sea. The tremendous industrial development along the shores of Lake Erie during the last 20 years makes it important from the standpoint of the United States that the adopted route should give convenient access to the ports on this lake. These routes will therefore not be further considered in detail in this report.

Respecting route (f) the commission said:

"A ship route through western New York along the general course of the Erie Canal is not regarded as a desirable project."

This is even more true to-day than it was at the time of the commission's report because of the extensive development of railroads and highways crossing this route and of other civic improvements along the line which would have to be disturbed at great cost and embarrassment to vested interests.

There remain for consideration, and for comparison of physical and commercial advantages or disadvantages the following routes or parts of routes:

1. Lake Erie to Lake Ontario.
  2. Lake Ontario to the Hudson River via Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route.
  3. Lake Ontario to a point on the St. Lawrence above Montreal, and thence via Lake Champlain to the Hudson River.
  4. The natural outlet to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence River.
- The Deep Waterways Commission recommended that surveys be made for—

- (a) Controlling the level of Lake Erie and projecting the Niagara Ship Canal.
- (b) Developing the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route.
- (c) Developing the St. Lawrence-Champlain route.
- (d) Improving the tidal Hudson River.
- (e) Improving intermediate channels of the Lakes.

The St. Lawrence Ship Channel is an international route, to be developed by joint action of the United States and Canada. Hence it was omitted from the lines recommended for survey by either country independently of the other, and, as will be shown later, steps were taken to have an adequate investigation of this route made by the proper authorities.

#### LAKE ERIE TO LAKE ONTARIO

Two routes were considered in the report of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways. One extended from Buffalo via Niagara River to Tonawanda, and thence to Olcott on Lake Ontario; the other via the Niagara River to La Salle, near the lower end of Grand Island, and thence to Lewiston on the lower Niagara River.

**Tonawanda-Olcott route:** This route follows the Niagara River to the head of Tonawanda Island, where it leaves the river and continues for a distance of 13.2 miles to the head of the escarpment west of Lockport, where the ridge to be cut through has an elevation of 636 feet above tidewater, or 71 feet above the water surface of the canal. From the top of the escarpment the line descends to Lake Ontario, 11.2 miles, with two single and three double locks of 40-foot lift each, one single lock of 30.5-foot lift, and three double locks each with 30-foot lift. At a distance of about 1 mile above Lake Ontario the line enters the gorge of Eighteenmile Creek and follows it to the lake. The length of the route from the foot of Lake Erie to the shore of Lake Ontario at Olcott is 35.9 miles, of which 9.9 miles would be improved river channel and 26 miles artificial canal. Estimates, based upon standard low water and also upon the higher levels possible by regulating Lake Erie, were as follows:

	Standard, low water	Lake Erie, regulated
20-foot canal.....	\$77,221,353	\$75,572,250
21-foot canal.....	49,274,894	48,453,753

**La Salle-Lewiston route:** The project of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways starts from Lake Erie at an elevation corresponding to the proposed regulated stage for the lake (574.5 feet) and, locking down into the river below the rapids on the same line as the Tonawanda-Olcott route, continues down the river to the head of Cayuga Island, and thence on a tangent, with a low-water level of 563.5 feet, to within a half mile of the foot of Lock No. 2, at the head of the escarpment above Lewiston. From the top of the escarpment the route passes down the bluff to the Niagara about a half mile below Lewiston, with six double locks of 40-foot lift each and two double locks of 39.4-foot lift each. The total lockage and slope from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario is 339 feet. The elevation at the points of maximum cutting is 620 feet above tidewater.

This project involved the relocation of 6 miles of double-track and 3 miles of single-track railroad and the construction of four railroad swing bridges, one railroad fixed bridge, and three highway swing bridges.

The total length of the waterway from the side of the proposed regulating works at the foot of Lake Erie to Lake Ontario is 30.5 miles, of which 18.9 miles is river channel and 11.6 miles canal. The estimates of cost were as follows:

	Standard low water	Lake Erie regulated
30-foot canal.....	\$75,084,453	\$73,435,350
21-foot canal.....	43,214,344	42,393,203

The Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways considered that this route was preferable to the Tonawanda-Olcott route.

In a report, dated August 30, 1919, on the diversion of water from the Great Lakes and Niagara River, by Col. J. G. Warren, this route

is again considered, with particular reference to an item contained in the act of July 27, 1916, calling for an examination of "Waterway or ship channel along the most practicable route between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario of sufficient capacity to admit the largest vessels now in use on the Great Lakes." The following revised estimates were submitted for a ship canal, without power development, along the La Salle-Lewiston route.

Size of prism	Size of locks	Cost
200 feet wide, 25 feet deep.....	650 feet long, 70 feet wide, 25 feet deep.	\$120,000,000
200 feet wide, 30 feet deep.....	800 feet long, 80 feet wide, 30 feet deep.	135,000,000
300 feet wide, 30 feet deep.....	800 feet long, 80 feet wide, 30 feet deep.	155,652,000

Cost of power development and navigation: 30 feet deep, \$203,000,000.

Still another route from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario has recently been proposed by the Erie & Ontario Sanitary Canal Co. Of this route, which will not be discussed in detail here, Col. J. W. Warren states in his report on diversion of water from the Great Lakes and Niagara River:

"As a navigation project, assuming that provision for such navigation is essential, the proposition is open to two fatal objections: First, the route crosses every railroad and road entering Buffalo from the east, south, and west, some 83 or more altogether, requiring about 70 movable bridges, and the consequent obstruction to traffic would be enormous; second, a better and much cheaper canal can be provided along the La Salle-Lewiston route."

The cost of this canal was estimated in Colonel Warren's report, issued in 1921, as \$401,760,000.

The completion of the Welland Ship Canal, which may be anticipated within three or four years, provides an important link in the ship canal to Montreal. While it is an essential part of the international and natural route to seaboard by way of the St. Lawrence River, it can not be regarded as a link in any proposed artificial waterway across the State of New York. The term "all-American waterway," which is being used so freely and improperly by interests opposed to the St. Lawrence Ship Channel, must necessarily include a new canal on the American side between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, or a direct route from Lake Erie which will accomplish the same purpose. Since the latter was considered by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways as less desirable than a route utilizing the Niagara Ship Canal, no surveys were made of it. The present cost of a new canal between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario must be added to the cost of any route from Lake Ontario to the Hudson River in order to determine the total cost of a waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River.

The only "all-American" route, however, is the international route, because it will serve the two great countries comprising the larger portion of the North American Continent.

#### LAKE ONTARIO TO HUDSON RIVER VIA OSWEGO-ONEIDA-MOHAWK ROUTE

The Oswego-Mohawk route was first surveyed for improvement in 1701. In 1829, upon opening the Oswego Canal, this route became navigable, the Erie Canal along the Mohawk River having been opened previously. This route was carefully surveyed by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, and its estimate of cost for a ship canal was presented in the report of 1900.

The line considered by the board leaves Lake Ontario from an artificial harbor formed by two breakwaters to be constructed about 1 mile west of the mouth of the Oswego River and passes through the westerly limits of the city, rising 85.6 feet in a distance of 5.7 miles to a dam above the town of Minetto, where the waterway joins the river. From Minetto the line follows the river 4.9 miles to the northern side of the village of Fulton, where it enters the valley of a small creek and continues across the swamp and sand ridges between the river and Oneida Lake. Two separate plans between Oneida Lake and the Mohawk River were considered, known as the high-level project and the low-level project. The summit level of the former is 416 feet and of the latter 379 feet above sea level at New York. From the Mohawk River at Herkimer the route is practically a rectification of the Mohawk River to Rotterdam Junction, then by a waterway along the south side of the Mohawk Valley, and thence across the divide through South Schenectady to the head of Normans Kill, which stream the line follows to the Hudson a short distance below the city limits of Albany.

The following estimates were presented by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways:

#### Estimates of costs, Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route

	Low-level project	High-level project
30-foot channel.....	\$199,925,661	\$195,870,085
21-foot channel.....	152,843,178	151,165,064



The high-level project contemplated 31 locks and the low-level 29 locks.

In 1919 the State engineer and surveyor of the State of New York estimated the cost of a 25-foot waterway via the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route at \$505,000,000. This estimate was based on the data contained in the reports of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, corrected so as to use unit prices current in 1919. No estimate for a 30-foot channel was prepared. Based on unit prices in 1924, the cost of a 25-foot canal would be in the neighborhood of \$700,000,000, while a 30-foot canal would cost close to \$1,000,000,000.

Concerning this route, it is important to keep in mind statements which have been made by the authorities which have been charged from time to time with its investigation.

The Deep Waterways Commission said:

"The data show that the route is capable of development for a second-class navigation."

The Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways opened its discussion of it with the following:

"The development of a project for a deep waterway from Lake Ontario to the Hudson via the Oswego and Mohawk Rivers is complicated with more difficult conditions than any other part of the proposed route from the Lakes to the sea."

In his report of August 30, 1919, Colonel Warren states:

"The building of the New York State Barge Canal along the Oswego-Mohawk route has made the construction of this ship canal as planned impossible and has rendered very difficult the provision of an adequate water supply for the summit level of any ship canal built along this route."

In his report, dated April 27, 1920, Lieut. Col. Clarke S. Smith, referring to a ship canal across the State of New York, states:

"All the superior features of the large vessel are lost in the canal. She is practically restricted to a speed nearly as low as that of the barge and will take a much longer time in passing through locks and bridges. Moreover, fixed charges and operation and maintenance expense of the canal must be added to the vessel cost of moving freight to determine the actual cost of transportation; and this item will be three or four times as great for the ship canal as for the barge canal."

#### LAKE ONTARIO TO HUDSON RIVER VIA ST. LAWRENCE-CHAMPLAIN ROUTE

The route considered by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways extends from the foot of Lake Ontario to the lower end of the Oswego-Mohawk route at the mouth of Normans Kill, below Albany, and consists of three parts: First, St. Lawrence division, from the foot of Lake Ontario to the lower end of Lake Francis on the St. Lawrence River; second, a canal from Lake Francis to Lake Champlain; and third, the Hudson River division, from Lake Champlain to the southern terminus. The estimates of cost were as follows:

	21-foot channel	30-foot channel
First division.....	\$21,027,113	\$35,514,438
Second division.....	47,912,678	64,008,981
Third division.....	67,927,720	103,216,977
Total.....	136,867,511	202,740,396

It will be noted that the first division, or St. Lawrence River section, was comparatively inexpensive. The remainder, however, involves engineering and physical complications which makes the route as a whole very expensive. The Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways considered it inadvisable to adopt this route.

#### ST. LAWRENCE RIVER TO MONTREAL

This is the natural outlet to the sea for the waters of the Great Lakes, and it is the natural and most readily improved route for commerce. It is an international route, and as such can be surveyed and developed only by joint action of the United States and Canada. Hence it was necessarily omitted from the surveys made by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways. Under our treaty with Great Britain the International Joint Commission is vested with jurisdiction over questions affecting the use of boundary waters, and this commission in 1920 made an investigation of the proposed ship channel from Lake Ontario to Montreal. A plan and estimate by engineers representing the United States and Canada was prepared for the commission's consideration.

The plan contemplated the construction of a waterway with locks of the same dimensions as the Welland Ship Canal; that is, 820 feet usable length by a width of 80 feet and a depth on the miter sills of 30 feet at low water. Width of confined channels were to be 220 feet and of open channels 450 feet, the latter being the width of the ship channel below Montreal.

The estimate for a 25-foot waterway (locks 30 feet deep) was \$252,728,200, and for a 30-foot waterway, \$270,714,380. This plan would develop 1,464,000 horsepower of electrical energy. About \$100,000,000 of both estimates was for power development, the remainder being the

cost properly chargeable to navigation. The project includes seven lift locks and two guard locks.

#### III. COMPARISON OF PROJECTS

As the results of the various official studies showed that with all its difficulties and disadvantages the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route was preferable to the Erie Canal route, or the Lake Champlain route, detailed analysis of the conditions affecting the practicability and use of a waterway across the State of New York will be confined to the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route. The need for a ship channel connecting the Great Lakes with the sea is now generally admitted. The statesmen of broad vision and with no selfish purpose or sectional interest to promote, both in the United States and Canada, stand squarely behind the development of the natural route to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence River. Their stand rests upon no uncertain or visionary perspective. It is based upon the careful consideration of unbiased data brought together and analyzed by able economists and engineers.

With the avowed purpose of defeating or delaying the consummation of this important project, opponents with a purpose clearly selfish and sectional, have brought from discard the ofttime rejected project for a ship canal across the State of New York by way of the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route. There is no danger that men familiar with commerce and shipping will acclaim this project as a solution of the problems of the West. There is danger, however, that the citizen who has no opportunity to examine the facts may be misled. That is the hope and purpose of the opposition at this time.

The proposition of a ship canal across the State of New York is not new to the people of the West, any more than it is to authorities of the State of New York, who have studied and rejected it. It has been examined from all essential viewpoints, and has been found to be inadequate. There is no need for speculation upon this point for the facts speak for themselves. The mid-west is justly entitled to the best route to the sea, and some of the important factors governing the determination of the best route are as follows: Engineering data, the ease, safety and dependency of navigation, and the cost of vessel operation.

Let us, therefore, turn the searchlight of comparison squarely upon the two projects for a ship channel from the Great Lakes to tide-water—first, by the St. Lawrence River to Montreal, and second, by a canal across the State of New York.

#### RESTRICTED NAVIGATION

The standard bottom widths of the New York Ship Canal, as adopted by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, were as follows:

	Rock section	Earth section
21-foot canal.....	<i>Fed</i> 240	<i>Fed</i> 215
30-foot canal.....	250	203

The entire length of the waterway from Oswego to the Hudson consists of confined or restricted channel, with the exception of 20 miles at Oneida Lake. The construction of the Barge Canal has rendered difficult and impracticable a waterway along the exact line contemplated in the report of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways. The probable route would correspond more closely with that outlined in the Symons report, already referred to. The nature of the navigation is indicated by the following table, the data being as given in the Symons report:

#### Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk Ship Canal, from Oswego to Troy, N. Y.

Section	Waterway, canalized		
	Lake	River	Canal
	<i>Miles</i>	<i>Miles</i>	<i>Miles</i>
Oswego River, Oswego to near Phoenix.....		21	
Oneida River cutting, Oswego River to Oneida Lake.....			10
Oneida Lake.....	20		
Wood Creek Valley.....			10
Rome summit.....			11
Upper Mohawk Valley to Little Falls.....			29
Mohawk River Channel, Little Falls to near Cohoes.....		73	
Cohoes to Troy.....			5
Total.....	20	94	65

The Mohawk River improvement can not be regarded as other than restricted navigation, because the cross-section of this river is so small as to make it wholly unfitted in its natural state for ship navigation. In Oneida Lake there is a depth of 30 feet for about 14 miles, and the navigation through this lake may be classed as unrestricted. There is thus a total of 150 miles of very restricted navigation in the proposed ship canal between Oswego and Troy.

In the proposed development of the ship channel between Lake Ontario and Montreal there is a total of only 33 miles of canal navigation. The remainder consists of deep lakes and of long, deep pools formed by

the dams, affording full-speed navigation for ships. Between Lake Ontario and the upper end of the stretch to be thus improved, a distance of about 65 miles, there is now a channel 30 feet or more in depth, with a minimum width of 500 feet, providing better navigation than will be available to ships in the upper Hudson River. With the exception of the 33 miles of canal above mentioned, there is no place in the St. Lawrence improvement where the navigation will be of the restricted character to be found in the canal and canalized-river sections of the proposed New York Ship Canal. As against 33 miles of restricted navigation in the St. Lawrence waterway, the New York Ship Canal will have 159 miles of equally restricted navigation. The former is only a little more than a fifth of the latter. By the route of the present Oswego Barge Canal there would be about 165 miles of highly restricted navigation, plus 20 miles of open navigation through Oneida Lake and 153 miles of more or less restricted navigation in the Hudson River.

The interests opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway have objected to the amount of restricted navigation on this route and have sought to give the impression that vessels would not use a route with so much restricted navigation. The facts show that not only will the St. Lawrence waterway have less restricted navigation than several successful ship canals in the world, and one-fifth that of the Oswego-Hudson route, but that there is no successful ship canal in the world with as much restricted navigation as the proposed New York Ship Canal.

The following table has been taken from "Transportation Economics of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Ship Channel," by Alfred H. Ritter, to which a final item has been added showing clearly the unfavorable position of the New York Ship Canal in comparison with other ship canals of the world, and the proposed St. Lawrence waterway:

*Dimensions of important ship canals*

Name of waterway	Length of improved section (restricted navigation), statute miles	Minimum channel dimensions		Locks		
		Depth, feet	Bottom width, feet (minimum-maximum)	Length, feet	Width, feet	Depth, feet
Proposed St. Lawrence, Montreal to Lake Ontario	23.0	25-30	200-400	820	80	30
Manchester Canal	38.0	28.0	120-180	600	65	28
Kiel Canal	61.0	36.1	145	1,083	148	40-45
Suez Canal	102.0	36.1	137			
Panama Canal	50.0	41.0	300-1,000	1,000	110	41
Houston Ship Canal	50.0	25.0	100-150			
Sabine-Neches Canal (to Desumont and Orange, Tex.)	49.0	23.0	125	586	50	28
New Welland Canal	25.0	25-30	200	820	80	30
Amsterdam Canal	15.5	32	164-197	738	82	31
New York Ship Canal (via present Oswego-Mohawk route)	165.0	25	203	600	60	25

It will be seen that the proposed New York Ship Canal has 50 per cent more restricted navigation than the Suez Canal, which has no locks. It has more than twice the length of restricted navigation of any lock canal in the world suitable for ocean vessels. The length of restricted navigation, combined with the delays and dangers of the large number of lockages, are certain to exert an unfavorable influence upon shipping. Few vessels would make this trip between New York and Lake Ontario by the New York Ship Canal if the St. Lawrence route were available.

#### LOCKAGE

Comparison of the actual lockage required in passing from Lake Ontario to the sea shows pronounced advantages by way of the St. Lawrence River. The following table gives the figures:

*Lockage, Lake Ontario to tidewater*

	Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route		St. Lawrence route
	High-level plan	Low-level plan	
	Feet	Feet	Feet
Lake Ontario to summit	170.6	133.6	0.0
Summit to tidewater	416.0	379.0	0.0
Total, Lake Ontario to tidewater	586.6	512.6	225.0

The above figures show that the artificial route across New York would involve more than twice the lockage of the natural or St. Lawrence route, a very serious if not a prohibitive objection. The actual lockage on the St. Lawrence between Lake Ontario and Montreal is only 225 feet, although the total fall to the sea is 244.5 feet. The

difference in lockage via the two routes is due to the necessity of passing over the summit level, or ridge, which rises high above the level of Lake Ontario on the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route. Oneida Lake is 125 feet above Lake Ontario. Concerning this, the report of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways makes the following statement:

"In the project by the Oswego and Mohawk Rivers it is proposed to lock up from the elevation of 245.4 feet at Oswego Harbor to 379 feet for the low-level plan and 416 feet for the high-level system on the summit between Oneida Lake and the Mohawk River, in both of which projects the water to generate power for operating the locks and for locking ships across the divide must be secured by storage in reservoirs located on the waterway or on adjacent watersheds. The lockage required to cross the divide with the low-level project will be 267 feet and for the high-level project 341 feet, making the route expensive to construct and slow to navigate."

The additional number of locks required by the Lake Ontario-Hudson River route, as compared with the St. Lawrence, is likewise a serious disadvantage to navigation, not only on account of the greater delay permanently involved but also because of the increased hazard due to extraordinary delays due to damage to lock gates, etc.

The following shows the superiority of the St. Lawrence route in this respect:

Lift locks	
Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk route:	Number
Low-level plan	29
High-level plan	31
St. Lawrence Ship Channel	7

To reach Lake Erie the LaSalle-Lewiston Canal, proposed by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, would involve the passage of nine lift locks, while the Welland Ship Canal on the international route will have but seven lift locks.

The passage from Montreal to Lake Erie, via the St. Lawrence or international route, will involve the passage of only 14 lift locks, while the passage from New York to Lake Erie, via the New York canals, would involve the passage of a minimum of 38 locks.

As in the Welland Ship Canal, the difference in levels on the international route are to be overcome by constructing the locks in flight, permitting a quicker passage for vessels. Engineers have estimated that when locks are so constructed the time required to pass a vessel through two locks is only one-third longer than is required to pass through one lock. This plan of lock placement, however, can not be carried out on the route across New York by reason of the distribution of the grade. The Oswego-Hudson route requires four times as many locks as will be required on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Lake Ontario.

Let these facts impress themselves clearly upon the mind:

New York route: Not less than 512.6 feet of actual lockage to reach Lake Ontario from New York; 842.6 feet of lockage to reach Lake Erie. Number of locks required to reach Lake Erie, 38.

International route: 225 feet of lockage to reach Lake Ontario; from Montreal, 555 feet of lockage to reach Lake Erie. Number of locks required to reach Lake Erie, 14.

#### BRIDGES

The drawbridge is a dangerous obstruction to ship navigation, and should be avoided across any narrow channel which is part of a through route. An ocean vessel can not safely stop and lose its steerage way while awaiting the opening of a drawbridge unless it is handled by tugs. The employment of tugs to handle an ocean vessel through an artificial canal across the State of New York would involve an expense which would in itself make the proposition commercially impracticable. Moreover, the obstruction of railroad and highway traffic which drawbridges would necessarily involve would be an unwarranted burden against traffic moving to and from New England.

There are 306 railroad and highway bridges across the New York State canals. Of these, 82 are on the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk line, between Lake Ontario and Waterford. Fourteen of these are railroad bridges. The minimum vertical clearance is 15½ feet, and not one of these bridges has sufficient clearance to pass an ocean vessel. All would require reconstruction. A height of 130 to 140 feet is required to permit the passage of ocean vessels.

To reconstruct railroad bridges so as to meet these requirements, with due regard to proper grades, would involve tremendous expense, and the approaches would have to be carried back generally several miles. Regardless of the engineering feasibility of such a plan, the negotiation of the grades would involve a perpetual expense to rail traffic which would amount to many millions of dollars annually.

The territory along the route of the proposed New York State canal is highly developed and the improvements in the way of cities, towns, streets, highways, industrial plants, etc., have reached a state where a radical alteration in conditions would disturb many important interests.

With the St. Lawrence route the situation is very different. The territory adjacent to this river between Montreal and Lake Ontario is still largely undeveloped. There are fewer bridges across the river than now exist on the Hudson River between New York and Troy. Under the plan of improvement proposed there would be about 10



bridges across the waterway, including the 33 miles of lateral canal. The interference due to bridges will be only about one-eighth that to be encountered on the proposed New York State canal.

#### IV. NEEDS OF COMMERCE AND SHIPPING

##### TYPES OF VESSELS

During the period 1896-1900, when the investigation of the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways and the committee on canals of the State of New York were in progress, the large lake bulk freighter was a very different ship than those now in use on the Great Lakes. In 1897 there were 17,171 passages of vessels through the Soo Canal, with a total net registered tonnage of 17,610,933, or a little more than 1,000 tons per vessel. In 1924 there were 17,866 passages, with a total net registered tonnage of 57,290,232. The number of passages since the period of the vessel studies above referred to has not materially increased, but the average tonnage per vessel is now three times as great, and the largest types now carry twice the cargo of the large lake vessel of 1900.

The study made by Major Symons, which was later adopted by the committee on canals of the State of New York, found a slight advantage in the use of barges operating on a 12-foot canal as compared with a lake ship operating over the proposed long restricted canal across the State of New York. At that time it was considered that the large lake carrier was more likely to proceed through a ship canal to New York than was the ocean carrier to proceed into the Lakes, regardless of the fact that a transfer of cargo was involved in the former case, which would be avoided in the latter. It is interesting to compare the bulk lake freighter of that time with the ships now engaged in handling bulk cargoes on the Great Lakes, as follows:

Large lake bulk freighters, 1897 and 1925

	1897	1925
Length over all, feet.....	428	617
Breadth, feet.....	48	64
Cargo capacity, tons.....	7,000	14,000

The vessels in most general use in carrying the world's ocean commerce range in length from 375 to 450 feet. They are accustomed to the navigation of ship canals, and would have no difficulty in navigating the proposed St. Lawrence Ship Channel. It may be very seriously doubted, however, if ocean vessels would attempt the passage of an artificial waterway of the length and restricted dimensions of the New York Ship Canal. Certainly a vessel would not do so if the natural route by way of the St. Lawrence were available. The present lake vessel, however, is too long and of too poor maneuvering ability to navigate the proposed New York Ship Canal. It is shown elsewhere that for the traffic between the Great Lakes and the Pacific coast the New York canal would be a shorter route in miles than the St. Lawrence, but that on the time basis used by Major Symons a vessel proceeding by way of the St. Lawrence would reach her destination as soon as a vessel navigating the New York State canal. And it is not of negligible importance that she would be much surer of reaching it by the St. Lawrence. A vessel, say, with a cargo of lumber from the Pacific coast for Great Lakes destinations would invariably choose the St. Lawrence route in preference to the New York Ship Canal, not only because it would actually take no longer under normal conditions, but because the risk of being held up by the numerous accidents to which a long, narrow canal with many locks and bridges is always subject would serve as a constant warning. The limited capacity of the New York Ship Canal would necessarily bring about congestion and extraordinary delays which would transform estimated profits into losses, and would keep rates higher than on the St. Lawrence route. The result would deter vessels from using it, just as the slow navigation through the present barge canal has discouraged vessels from operating on the canal and has driven the better types to the St. Lawrence route.

If no ship channel were available between Montreal and Lake Ontario, it would be cheaper for ocean vessels to transfer cargo at Montreal to the vessels navigating the present 14-foot canals of the St. Lawrence River than to attempt the passage of the New York Ship Canal. Indeed, through navigation on the St. Lawrence by small-type vessels which are now bringing overseas cargoes into the Great Lakes is to be preferred to an unsatisfactory and dangerous 25-foot navigation across the State of New York. For the types of vessels needed to transport cargoes into the Great Lakes it would be wholly inadequate. No depth less than 27 feet would suffice, and 30 feet should be the objective. With suitable channel widths the cost becomes prohibitive.

##### TONNAGE CAPACITY

Under the most favorable conditions of operation, the capacity of the proposed New York Ship Canal is 30,000,000 tons annually, or 15,000,000 tons in one direction. The capacity of the St. Lawrence waterway is practically unlimited, because it is possible to add additional locks when those of the original plan have reached their full

operating limit. The water supply of the entire Great Lakes system, as represented by a mean flow of 241,000 cubic feet per second at the foot of Lake Ontario, is available to meet the future needs of commerce and shipping.

Not so with the New York canal, however. Oneida Lake, when converted into a storage reservoir, can supply only about 1,100 cubic feet per second when evenly distributed throughout the season. The capacity of 15,000,000 tons in one direction is the fixed maximum which the expenditure of \$500,000,000 will make possible. Additional capacity on the St. Lawrence will involve only duplicate locks, while equivalent additional capacity on the New York canal will require not only duplicate locks, but enormous expenditures for additional reservoirs to supply the additional water.

The inadequacy of this capacity will be evident from the statement that in 1924 the total grain moving down the Great Lakes was 15,222,787 tons, and the total shipped from upper lake ports by both rail and water in 1923 was 589,008,180 bushels, or about 13,000,000 tons. This was greatly exceeded in 1924, and the statistics show a constant increase.

The grain traffic, it must be remembered, is not evenly distributed throughout the season of navigation. Of the 13,000,000 tons of grain now moving to seaboard via the lake route, more than 50 per cent is concentrated during the last three months of the season, and the movement during the peak period of 30 days is about 100,000,000 bushels, or 2,000,000 tons. Not only would the capacity of the New York Ship Canal be insufficient for the total grain flow alone, if evenly distributed through the year, but it would fail utterly to meet the requirements of the peak period occurring during the low-water season in the fall.

Grain is only one commodity which will move outbound. The important commodities and the amount of each, which are now available for outbound movement, are as follows:

Exports—outbound traffic		Tons
Grain.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Flour and meal.....	1,211,301	1,211,301
Houliny and grits.....	84,543	84,543
Cereal foods, various.....	12,985	12,985
Feeds.....	31,580	31,580
Starch, glucose, and corn sugar.....	208,075	208,075
Meats.....	263,781	263,781
Animal oils and fats.....	366,173	366,173
Lined cake and meal.....	128,351	128,351
Chemicals, miscellaneous.....	82,895	82,895
Iron and steel.....	905,395	905,395
Copper.....	100,735	100,735
Paper.....	59,771	59,771
Soap.....	13,771	13,771
Sulphate of ammonia.....	88,270	88,270
Automobiles and parts.....	115,222	115,222
Agricultural implements.....	54,527	54,527
Miscellaneous.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Domestic—outbound		
Grain.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
Automobile.....	375,000	375,000
Flour.....	660,000	660,000
Iron ore.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Miscellaneous.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total.....	22,348,603	22,348,603

The above figures were based on our commerce in 1922. For 1924 they would have to be increased 13 per cent, making a total available outbound traffic of 27,000,000 tons. But neither 1922 or 1924 represents the future traffic requirements. Moreover, the above figures represent available through traffic only. It is not feasible to exclude from the canal the local traffic moving to and from points on the canal or on the Hudson River.

What will be the needs in 20, 50, and 100 years? That our commerce will continue to grow in the future as it has in the past needs no argument. To-day the needs are far beyond the practical capacity of the proposed New York Ship Canal, and in 20 or 50 years from now the situation will be much more unfavorable for any artificial waterway across the State of New York. Decision as to the proper route must look far into the future. It must contemplate the needs when the commerce of the country has grown to several times its present volume. Certainly it would be folly to recommend a project which would be incapable of meeting future needs and of stimulating commercial growth. The St. Lawrence deep waterway has no such disability.

##### V. DISTANCES

As Oswego, N. Y., marks the junction of a ship-canal route across the State of New York with Lake Ontario, it may be considered as the point of divergence of the St. Lawrence and New York ship-canal routes to the Atlantic.

In the following table the commercial regions of the world have been segregated into groups and a carefully chosen key point assigned to each group; for instance, any vessel from New York or the Gulf of St. Lawrence bound for the Pacific coast, the Orient, or the west coast of South America would naturally move via the Panama Canal, hence Colon, the eastern entrance of the Panama Canal, has been chosen as a key point for one group. The disparity of distance between the two routes to the various groups occurs between Oswego and the key point.

Distances in statute miles

World markets	Key points	Oswego to New York via ship canal, thence by regular ocean routes	Oswego to Montreal via St. Lawrence Ship Channel, thence by regular ocean routes	In favor of the New York route	In favor of the St. Lawrence route
United Kingdom.....	Liverpool.....	4,045	3,434	-----	611
Northern Europe, Baltic ports.....	Copenhagen.....	4,766	4,120	-----	646
Northwestern Europe, western Europe.....	Bishops Rock.....	3,833	3,508	-----	325
Southern Europe, eastern Mediterranean ports, east coast Africa, India, Straits Settlements, East Indies.....	Gibraltar.....	4,052	3,898	-----	154
Pacific coast, North America, west coast South America, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Orient, Australia, New Zealand.....	Colon.....	2,611	3,866	1,255	-----
West coast Africa.....	St. Vincent (Cape Verdi Islands).....	3,694	3,912	218	-----
East coast South America.....	Pernambuco.....	4,596	5,160	564	-----
Gulf of Mexico ports.....	Key West.....	1,688	3,007	1,321	-----
West Indies, Central America.....	Nassau, N. P. I.....	1,446	2,763	1,320	-----
Northeastern coast, South America.....	Barbados.....	2,443	3,321	878	-----

The preceding table shows that to four key points the St. Lawrence route is the shorter, and it is in the trade zones governed by these points that the interior is most vitally concerned. For all traffic moving between points in the Central West, South America, and those reached by way of the Panama Canal the Mississippi River would serve much better than the Oswego-Hudson Canal. The distance from St. Louis to Colon is 2,768 miles via the Mississippi route, while by way of the Illinois River, Great Lakes, and New York Ship Canal it is 4,023 miles, a difference of 1,255 miles in favor of the former route. Hence the claims made for actual traffic movements to and from this central western territory by way of a New York Ship Canal are not well founded.

The long, winding, tortuous route across New York, between Lake Ontario and the Hudson River, is beset with numerous delays because of the multiplicity of locks, bridges, and reduced speed due to the many miles of strictly confined channel and congestion of vessels. The latest survey shows that this section will be crossed by 82 bridges. Not only would the movement of a vessel through such a waterway be extremely slow, tedious, and costly, but the delays to traffic passing over the numerous railroad and highway bridges, due to the opening and closing of these bridges, would make it almost uneconomical to permit ships to pass through the waterway.

On the other hand, the St. Lawrence project reduces the present number of locks to seven and restricted navigation to 33 miles, all of which means a loss of only a few hours compared to headway through open navigation.

As has already been stated, on the basis of Major Symon's estimate of vessel speed on the New York route, a vessel using the St. Lawrence route would arrive at all the preceding key points, even though steaming many miles farther, sooner than a vessel navigating the New York route to these same points, except to Colon and the sailing time required to this point would not differ greatly over the two routes.

For freight-liner service the present tendency is toward the use of faster ships. Vessels having a speed of 10 knots or less are still used for full cargoes of bulk freight, but speed of delivery is highly important for all classes of general cargo and present-day requirements necessitate a speed of 12 to 14 knots for freight-liner service. This is equivalent to about 14 to 16 statute miles per hour. An average speed of 15 miles per hour, or 360 miles per day, is fairly representative of the present freight liner. The more modern vessels operating between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, carrying general cargo, are so powered.

The passage through the New York ship canal from Oswego to New York will require an average of five days. This is equivalent to 1,250 miles navigation in open water by tramps and 1,800 miles by freight liners.

#### COST CAPITAL COST

The most recent estimate for a ship canal of 25-foot draft between Lake Ontario and the Hudson River is \$506,000,000. To provide such a canal wholly within American territory, between Lakes Erie and Ontario, there must be added \$125,000,000, making the total cost of the so-called "all-American route" \$631,000,000.

The official estimate for a 25-foot channel in the St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Lake Ontario, with locks 30 feet deep, is \$252,728,200, and for a 30-foot channel, \$270,714,380. More than \$100,000,000 of the cost of the St. Lawrence development, however, is for works required solely for water power, making the cost of navigation improvements \$152,000,000 and \$170,000,000, respectively, to be borne by two nations—Canada and the United States. The estimates of the cost of the two routes for navigation are therefore as follows:

#### Estimated cost

	St. Lawrence Ship Channel	United States share of St. Lawrence	New York Ship Canal
25-foot project.....	\$152,000,000	\$76,000,000	\$506,000,000
30-foot project.....	170,000,000	\$85,000,000	(1)

<sup>1</sup> No estimate.

#### INTEREST, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

The estimate for interest, maintenance, and operations of the 25-foot draft New York Ship Canal now available is \$30,300,000, which includes interest, except that no interest is added for capital expended during the period of construction. This estimate covers certain items in addition to the canal from Lake Ontario to the Hudson River. For this canal alone, the annual charges would apparently be about \$25,000,000. The official estimate for maintenance and operation of the St. Lawrence Ship Channel is \$2,562,000 annually. Of this amount \$1,457,000 is chargeable to the power development and \$1,105,000 is chargeable to navigation. One-half the navigation item, or \$552,500, is the amount chargeable to the United States.

#### DIVISION OF COST

In the case of the all New York Ship Canal, the United States would have to bear the entire cost of approximately \$25,000,000 annually for a 25-foot waterway from Oswego to the Hudson. To this must be added the interest and maintenance of a New York canal connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, amounting for a 25-foot canal to \$5,000,000 interest, plus \$1,000,000 maintenance and operation, a total of \$6,000,000. There would thus be an annual burden of about \$31,000,000 as the penalty for possessing a so-called "all-American" waterway.

#### COST PER ANNUM

Charging 4 per cent interest on the investments in original improvements, plus the estimated outlay for maintenance and operation, the annual cost of the two projects for navigation would be as follows:

	United States share of St. Lawrence Ship Channel	All New York Ship Canal
25-foot project.....	\$3,562,500	\$31,000,000
30-foot project.....	3,952,500	(1)

<sup>1</sup> No estimate.

With this evidence of the vastly greater expense of building and operating a project of doubtful value across the State of New York, as compared with a thoroughly practical waterway by way of the St. Lawrence, what legitimate reason can be assigned for giving serious consideration to the New York route?

#### THE EFFECT UPON NEW ENGLAND

The New England States have a vital interest in the construction of a ship channel connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean. It is well known that this section is the center of many of the country's most important industries. Notwithstanding the industrial importance of New England it has been apparent for some time that with the continued movement westward of the center of population of the country and the establishment of competing industries throughout the Central West and the South, the New England States are being placed in a most unfavorable position. The center of population is now at a distance of more than 1,000 miles from the highly developed industrial districts in New England. The cost of reaching the important central western markets has become so great as to seriously handicap New England in the distribution of her products.

The figures also show that New England is becoming more and more dependent upon other localities for her raw materials and her food supply. Economical transportation of this food supply therefore becomes a question of interest to all consumers in New England. These food supplies originate in a territory adjacent to the Great Lakes and find their way mainly to primary markets located directly on the Lakes. There is thus both an eastbound and a westbound traffic to and from New England upon which lower transportation costs are urgently



needed; in the one case to permit competition with other industrial districts, and in the other to secure at lower cost the raw materials and food products necessary for the sustenance of New England's population.

A horizontal decrease in rail rates would not improve the competitive situation, and there is no possibility of any adjustment in rail rates which would give New England any substantial improvement in so far as the competitive situation is concerned. The only feasible means by which an adjustment of rates favorable to New England may be secured is by the introduction of economical water transportation. The necessary economies can be secured only through the use of deep-draft vessels, such as operate on the ocean or on the Great Lakes.

They can not be secured by means of barge transportation, which the experience of New York shows to be only slightly cheaper in cost than rail transportation. The possibilities and the influence of economical transportation in creating new business is shown by the remarkable development of intercoastal traffic through the Panama Canal. The opening of this canal has made it possible for New England to enter into commercial relations with the Pacific coast, which formerly were impossible because of the prohibitive cost of rail transportation. A ship channel into the Great Lakes by way of the St. Lawrence River would open up similar opportunities for trade with the great landlocked area of the Mid-West.

It is the premise of the proponents that the New York Ship Canal will greatly benefit New England. As already shown, such a canal would have several times the amount of restricted navigation as the St. Lawrence route; and to repeat, if we may, there is grave doubt as to whether it would be attractive to deep-draft vessels at all. If lake vessels were able to proceed through such a canal, it is very clear that New York would be their eastern terminus; and, likewise, intercoastal vessels from the Pacific coast would reach the Great Lakes via the port of New York and Hudson River, ignoring completely the New England ports. Therefore, instead of improving the situation such a canal would effectually isolate New England, New York would be nearer the Great Lakes than Boston and Portland, Me., and there would be little or no business moving to the latter ports. By way of the St. Lawrence, however, the reverse is true. The New England ports would be the nearest seaports to the Great Lakes and the lower rates which they would undoubtedly secure would improve their economic position materially. The St. Lawrence route is the one and only real opportunity which will place New England in a favorable competitive position. The New York ship canal route would hurry and eventually complete the commercial isolation of New England.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The comparison between the two routes shows the following outstanding differences:

(1) Restricted navigation: Thirty-three miles in the St. Lawrence between Lake Ontario and Montreal. One hundred and fifty-nine miles in the New York route:

(2) Lockage: On the St. Lawrence, Lake Ontario to tidewater, 225 feet, using 7 locks. New York route, Lake Ontario to tidewater, 512 feet by low-level plan, using 29 locks; high-level plan, 586 feet, 31 locks.

(3) Bridges: St. Lawrence route not to exceed 10; no obstruction to navigation. New York route, about 90.

(4) Capacity: St. Lawrence unlimited. New York route, maximum 15,000,000 tons one way. Increased capacity via New York involves a tremendous expenditure as compared to the St. Lawrence.

(5) Distances: St. Lawrence route has a very great advantage to the important European markets, which any waterway between the Lakes and the Atlantic is particularly required to reach. The New York route is shorter to the Atlantic seaboard, South America, and Pacific Coast, but the navigation difficulties more than offset these apparent mileage advantages.

(6) Cost: St. Lawrence navigation improvement for 25-foot draft, United States share, \$76,000,000. "All-American route" across New York, \$631,000,000. Annual charges on the St. Lawrence for the United States, \$3,592,500. The all-New York route, \$31,000,000, all payable by the United States.

(7) Effect on New England: The St. Lawrence will give New England ports a distinct advantage. The New York route, on the contrary, will bring about the complete commercial isolation of that important section of the United States.

The above comparisons show so clearly the advantages of the St. Lawrence route that there is no room for doubt regarding the advisability of its selection.

The West is justly entitled to the best outlet to the sea, and the taxpayers of the country who must pay the cost are entitled to the same protection and the same careful appraisal of return per dollar of investment as they would personally give their private undertakings.

Can this board justify a recommendation to expend four times the amount required for an adequate waterway route, to construct an

inadequate canal of inferior navigability, limited capacity, and reduced transportation savings by way of a long artificial canal over the divide between the Great Lakes and Hudson River?

The farmer is looking to this waterway to overcome the economic spread between agriculture and industry.

The New York opposition offers as a solution to the marketing problems of the greatest producing area on this continent—the Mid-West—a much longer route, both in distance and cost, to the most important consuming centers of its products—European markets.

As stated by the Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, 1900, referring to an incident of 1812, "it was then, and is still, openly admitted that the St. Lawrence River is the natural outlet and the line of least resistance for a waterway from the Great Lakes to tidewater, but that for New York State to permit such a canal to be built would be to commit commercial suicide," and still further as stated by the Deep Waterways Commission, the Oswego-Onondaga-Mohawk route across the State of New York "is capable of development for a second-class navigation" only, while "The St. Lawrence route is justified as a seaboard route on its merits and independent of all other considerations."

The Mid-West demands its right to go to the sea by the route that is most feasible from the engineering standpoint, the best from the standpoint of trade requirements, and the best from the standpoint of national and international development, good will, and abiding peace—from the Great Lakes to the ocean by way of the St. Lawrence.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its order previously made, adjourned until Monday, March 22, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

*Scheduled for March 20, 1926*

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Agriculture relief legislation.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Authorizing appropriations for construction at military posts (H. R. 10275).

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

(10 a. m.)

Providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Pineville, Ky. (H. R. 5953).

Providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Madisonville, Ky. (H. R. 3879).

*Scheduled for March 22, 1926*

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Agriculture relief legislation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend and supplement the merchant marine act of 1920 and the shipping act of 1916 (H. R. 8052 and H. R. 5369).

To provide for the operation and disposition of merchant vessels of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation (H. R. 5395).

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

398. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill "To authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2752. An act for the purchase of land as an artillery range at Fort Ethan

Allen, Vt.; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 9957. A bill authorizing a survey for the control of excess flood waters of the Mississippi River below Point Breeze in Louisiana and on the Atchafalaya Outlet by the construction and maintenance of controlled and regulated spillway or spillways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. J. Res. 114. A joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to allot war trophies to the American Legion Museum; with amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DRIVER: Committee on the Territories. S. 3213. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys of the legally adjudged insane of Alaska who have been cared for by the Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5823. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia in relation to the qualifications of jurors; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9398. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; with amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7286. A bill to provide for the acquisition of property in Prince William County, Va., to be used by the District of Columbia for the reduction of garbage; with an amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 10204. A bill providing an additional wing to the District jail; with an amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7255. A bill to regulate the sale of kosher meat in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10498) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new post-office building at Methuen, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 10499) to amend sections 15 and 16 of an act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 10500) to authorize an appropriation for the reconditioning of the U. S. S. *Nantuxet*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10501) to repeal section 806 of the revenue act of 1926; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 10502) to amend section 8 of the food and drugs act, approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 10503) to authorize certain alterations to the six coal-burning battleships for the purpose of providing better launching and handling arrangements for airplanes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 10504) to amend the act approved June 4, 1897, by authorizing an increase in the cost of lands to be embraced in the Shiloh National Military Park, Pittsburg Landing, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 10505) to prevent deception in the sale of walnuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZIEHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10506) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for the park system of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10507) to require that articles purchased by the United States Government be manufactured in the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10508) to change the title of the Assistant to the Attorney General and to increase the salaries of the Assistant Attorneys General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10509) authorizing the Secretary of War to replace the granite with marble on the tomb of the unknown soldier in front of the memorial amphitheater in the Arlington Cemetery; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 10510) to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TILSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) authorizing certain military organizations to visit France, England, and Belgium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) for the construction of a wagon road from the town of Skagway, Alaska, to the international boundary at White Pass Summit, Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SWEET: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to correct an error made in the adjustment of the account between the State of New York and the United States, adjusted under the authority contained in the act of February 24, 1905 (33 Stat. L. p. 777), and appropriated for in the deficiency act of February 27, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Resolution (H. Res. 180) providing for appointment of special committee to extend invitations to certain citizens of the United States soliciting suggestions, criticisms, and comments on the status and tendencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 10511) authorizing the President to reappoint Capt. L. B. Cullen Jones, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of captain, Cavalry, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 10512) granting a pension to Adaline G. Huntoon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10513) granting a pension to Julia R. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10514) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bierley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10515) authorizing the payment of allowances for dependent mother of Commander John F. Cox, by the disbursing officers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10516) granting a pension to Deborah A. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10517) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 10518) for the relief of Jules Entenberg; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 10519) to authorize the appointment of David J. Fitzgerald to the grade of first lieutenant, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 10520) granting a pension to John F. Elkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 10521) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 10522) granting a pension to William A. Wilburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10523) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 10524) granting an increase of pension to Emily D. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 10525) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schoonmaker Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 10526) granting an increase of pension to Bridget R. Caden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10527) for the relief of O. H. Crisp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 10528) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 10529) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINY: A bill (H. R. 10530) to provide a survey of the Illinois River, Ill., and its tributaries, with a view to the control of floods therein; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 10531) granting an increase of pension to Emma Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10532) granting a pension to Thomas P. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10533) for the relief of the State Hospital of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10534) granting an increase of pension to Laura C. Woodley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10535) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10536) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 10537) granting a pension to Maud E. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 10538) to award a medal of honor to Capt. Jacques M. Swaab; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 205) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenses and services rendered in behalf of the Eastern, Emigrant, and Western Cherokees by blood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKEY: Resolution (H. Res. 181) to provide for additional compensation for assistant floor managers of telephones; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1339. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the National Guard Association of Massachusetts, in favor of House bill 9571; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1340. Also, resolution of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, against the present immigration law, which excludes aliens of Chinese and Japanese extraction; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1341. By Mr. FREDERICKS: Petition of residents of Los Angeles County, Calif., protesting against the so-called Sunday closing law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1342. Also, petition of members of the faculty of the University of Southern California, at Los Angeles, requesting amendment of the present copyright law; to the Committee on Patents.

1343. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Marseilles, Ill., urging support of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1344. Also, petition of the Streckfus Steamboat Line urging favorable action of the bill H. R. 6243; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1345. Also, petition of Vega Lodge, I. O. G. T., protesting against certain proposed changes in the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1346. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Mr. E. E. Gaylord, manager the National Commercial Teachers' Agency, Beverly, Mass., protesting against the Curtis-Reed educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

1347. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of A. T. Mack and other citizens, of Birmingham, Ala., for repeal of the eighteenth amendment to Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1348. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the St. Monica Society, an affiliated branch of the State Federation of Catholic Societies, protesting against the enactment of the Curtis-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

1349. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, protesting against the amendment to the liability act; to the Committee on Labor.

1350. Also, petition of the Holy Family Society, of Watkins, Minn., protesting against the enactment of the Curtis-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

1351. Also, petition of 65 voters of Kandiyohi County, Minn., urging the passage of House bills 71 and 7479; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1352. Also, petition of the State Federation of German Catholic Women of Minnesota protesting against the enactment of the Curtis-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

1353. Also, petition of the Morris Kiwanis Club, of Morris, Minn., urging the passage of the game refuge bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1354. Also, petition of 16 voters of Swift County, Minn., urging the passage of House bills 71 and 7479; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1355. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Mr. Thomas Foley Hisky, of Baltimore, transmits petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Marks Church, Catonsville, Md., protesting against passage of the Curtis-Reed educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

1356. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of State Department of Game and Fish, New Mexico, indorsing Senate bill 2015, establishing Federal fish hatchery and fish cultural station in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1357. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, favoring the passage of Senate bill 41, to encourage civil aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1358. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn, N. Y., disapproving of several bills now before Congress which have for their object the discontinuance of the manufacture under Post Office Department contract of stamped envelopes having return corner cards printed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1359. Also, petition of the Grand Camp, Alaska Native Brotherhood, opposing the passage of House bill 9211; to the Committee on the Territories.

1360. Also, petition of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for a national gallery of art in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

1361. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Mr. D. F. Smith and sundry citizens of Creek County, Okla., protesting against the passage of Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1362. Also, petition of Mrs. N. W. Taber and sundry citizens of Sapulpa, Okla., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1363. Also, petition of Mr. Clarence Myers and sundry citizens of Creek County, Okla., protesting against the passage of Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1364. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of members of Walter L. Raymond Camp, No. 111, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Andover, Mass., indorsing House bill 4023 to increase Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1365. Also, petition of residents of Hudson, Mass., opposing House bills 7179 and 7822, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1366. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution of National Guard Association of Massachusetts, favoring House bill 9571, with the exception that on page 3, line 18, there be omitted the words "and regulations"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1367. By Mr. WEAVER (by request): Petition of citizens of Fletcher, N. C., opposing laws regulating Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1368. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Chimney Rock, N. C., opposing laws regulating Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1369. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Hendersonville, N. C., opposing laws regulating Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1370. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Asheville, N. C., opposing laws regulating Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1371. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Candler, N. C., opposing laws regulating Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1372. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Culberson, N. C., opposing laws to regulate Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1373. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Messrs. Desaulniers & Co., Moline, Ill., urging repeal of capital-stock tax, and also repeal of the inheritance tax and the tax on stock transfers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1374. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Bertha Chapin and others, protesting against the passage of House bills 7179 and 7822, with reference to Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.